

THE

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1859.

ART. I.—SOME ACCOUNT OF COKESBURY COLLEGE.

THE General Conference of 1784, which gave to the Methodist societies in America an independent Episcopal Church, also gave to that Church her first literary institution. We have thought that a brief account of Cokesbury College might not be unacceptable to the readers of the "Quarterly," nor, we hope, altogether unprofitable. At any rate, to such as delight to look back on the early days of Methodism, to survey the infant in its cradle, and trace its progress from childhood to comparative maturity, articles of this sort will not be found wanting in interest.

The general history of the Methodist Episcopal Church has been well cared for, and may now be considered safe, at least sufficiently so to satisfy all reasonable demand for the present, and also to allay any apprehension of neglect in the future. Much credit is due to Dr. Bangs for the able and careful manner in which he has examined the stream of Methodism from its source, as far down as to 1840. Besides we have now the promise of another from a different quarter, which, taking still a wider range, and coming to us with the prestige of the well known ability of the author, will receive a cordial welcome from every Methodist, and leave but little to do for those that may come after. Local histories of places remarkable for the success of Methodism, and individual memoirs of men eminent for piety and influence in those early times, are still too few; these will continue to multiply, however, as the general subject becomes exhausted, and men continue to feel a more lively interest in things nearer home. And as for autobiographies, there are enough, we should think, to satisfy every felt want in the Church,

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XI.—12

and even to satiate that morbid appetite which seeks its gratification mostly in whatever is curious or startling.

It is somewhat humiliating, however, to know, that while so much has been done to explore and bring to light almost everything connected with early Methodism, nothing, or next to nothing, has been attempted to place before the public, in some popular form, the normal growth of education as found in connection with the very organization of the Church. This neglect does not apply, by any means, to the founders of the college. The records which they have left us, though meager, are generally clear and authentic. They are, in greater part, preserved in the Journals of Dr. Coke and Bishop Asbury, or in memoirs scarcely less to be respected. The deeds of the actors are often written in full detail. Still their history supplies no great attraction by its incidents; impressing rather with an interest more abiding in the theme than in the particulars of its illustration. The founders of the Methodist Episcopal Church were men of action. What they did was done as in the sight of God, and with a sanctified indifference as to what judgment might be passed upon their works by posterity, so that they stood approved before the Searcher of hearts. To them few vacant hours came for study, or for the use of the pen; enough, to be sure, to refresh their minds and to recruit their strength for renewed conflict, which was one, not of a day, but of a whole life. The course which they had chosen for themselves, and to which they invited others, was one of ceaseless, unmitigated toil. "Work while it is day," seemed never to have been absent from their minds. The Methodist societies originally, as reflected back at this distance, and as also compared with the quiet home comforts now so generally enjoyed, resembled a camp in the presence of an enemy, more than a flock safely folded beneath the eye of a shepherd; always on the watch, on the march, or in actual conflict with the foe. Even the victories won were but half enjoyed, by reason of the continuous contest, which brought with it but few intervals of rest. No Methodist preacher at that day, who "stuck by the stuff," counted his life dear to him in such a cause, nor did he seek to be dismissed from its hardships till death came to his relief and set him free. Unlike the ancient people of God, he had no jubilee, looked for none, till he found one in heaven that would last forever.

We are not taken, therefore, by surprise to find that our fathers wrote but little; nevertheless, like some of the early kings of England, though much unused to the pen, they made their mark broad and deep on the age in which they lived. The blame of neglect, so it seems to us, falls chiefly on those who saw the be-

ginning of Cokesbury College, and had long survived its melancholy fate—men of wisdom and of large experience, who should have spoken out while they could, and not have suffered the chronicles of our first college to die with the brains that nursed them. Others, not less criminal, who had become the depositories of documents rich in incident and abundant in illustration, parted with them forever, heedlessly committing them to the flames, under the plea that they “were in the way, and of no use to any one.” Alas! for the men who had not the wit to see nor the heart to value the riches of our college birthday, and of its simple-minded days of infancy.

The Methodist Episcopal Church has most worthy and urgent motive to call upon her children that they do not suffer the memory of her first college to perish. Although not quite seventy-three years have elapsed since it began to exist, already doubts are starting up around us which threaten to unsettle the current opinion as to the very place of its location, shifting it to a distance of three hundred miles from where it originally stood. A gentleman, living within five hours’ ride of the place, remarked to us, a few days since: “I thought the first Methodist college was in Abingdon, Virginia!” Thus each succeeding year brings with it more or less uncertainty with regard to many parts of our past history, especially of Cokesbury College; nor will this uncertainty be less painfully felt by putting off the labor of investigation to a more distant day. If, therefore, by any indifference, or still seeking for further delay, and idly hoping in every emergency, like one of the heroes of a modern novelist, for “something to turn up,” we may not so easily free ourselves of the charge of fostering skepticism in minds otherwise disposed to be set right, when it is made to appear that we have taken no pains to remove it.

Fortunately for us, four of the students of Cokesbury College are still living, full of years and of sound mind. Two of these have furnished us with interesting facts, drawn from a personal association with the college, and from an intimate acquaintance with its professors, much of which, we are sure, will be new to many, and will go very far to clear up some points darkly hinted at by Bishop Asbury. Whatsoever relics may have come to us, we hope to speed them toward that farthest futurity to which the ambition of history aspires, not diminished by what they have brought to our hands; enlarged, rather, and made more veritable by careful arrangement.

The idea of a college, as an integral part of organic Methodism, originated with Dr. Coke, who, it appears, opened his mind to

Mr. Asbury on the subject soon after their first interview at the house of Mr. Barratt, at Dover, in Delaware, November 15th, 1784. This distinguished messenger of the Church had just arrived from England, charged with the plan from Mr. Wesley for the future government of the Methodist societies in America, and had already adopted measures for notifying the preachers from abroad of the fact, inviting them to assemble in Baltimore on the eve of our Saviour's nativity, to consider the new arrangement, in its application to the circumstances in which they found themselves providentially placed by the proclamation of peace the year before, severing all political and ecclesiastical ties between the two countries. It seems, however, that in less than a month from the time of the conversation referred to, the plan of a college had been definitely settled, and, through the joint exertions of its two projectors, one thousand pounds sterling were secured toward the erection of the building. To facilitate the movement as much as possible, rules and regulations for the government of the proposed college, together with the principles on which they were founded, had been prepared by Dr. Coke; "these," says Mr. Drew in his life of the doctor, "after having been weighed and digested by the American Conference, were introduced by Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury into the newly-established seminary that was to be denominated Cokesbury College, this being a compound of both their names; a title not assumed by themselves, as has been alleged, from motives of personal vanity, but bestowed by the friends of the college as a mark of respect for its illustrious founders.

In determining the question as to where this first Methodist college should be placed, proper care would be observed, of course, in selecting the most eligible site, and still more the amount of influence which might be brought to bear upon its future prosperity. There can be no greater mistake in planting an institution of this kind, than to place it beyond the reach of its friends, under any supposed advantage arising from liberal offers of land, or anything else, where generous sympathy and direct patronage are wanting for its support, and which should always be present to cheer it on and to build it up. Mistakes of this kind, in one instance, we think, we have known, though much deplored afterward, when it was found too late to apply a remedy. No one acquainted with the relative influence and strength of the Methodist societies at the time the Church was organized, can doubt that Maryland offered the best home for Cokesbury College. Any one who will take the pains to examine the Minutes of the Conference of 1784, will readily perceive that the number of members composing all the societies in the United

States amounted to within a fraction of fifteen thousand. Of these New York had eighty-four, New Jersey nine hundred and sixty-three, Pennsylvania five hundred and sixty, Delaware nine hundred and eighty-two, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, with Georgia and Tennessee, had six thousand eight hundred and thirty-one, while Maryland alone had five thousand six hundred and forty-eight. It is not surprising, therefore, that at this early date Abingdon, in Maryland, in these respects, presented stronger claims for Cokesbury than any other place on the continent, being situated in the very heart of Methodism, and surrounded by more striking and tender recollections of its early triumphs than could be found elsewhere within the same limits. All through the country, in a circumference of thirty miles, the names of the first missionaries sent over by Mr. Wesley were inexpressibly dear to the people. Those of Boardman, Pilmoor, Rankin, and Shadford, taken in connection with Strawbridge, Williams, and King, were as "ointment poured forth." Here too some of our best men were raised up and sent out to plant the Gospel in other lands; that apostolic man, Freeborn Garrettson, to Nova Scotia; Joshua Wells, George Roberts, and George Pickering, to assist Jesse Lee in New England. From this common center of Methodism went out many a strong man to the West and South, whose faithful labors soon made the "wilderness and solitary places glad for them." At a distance of five miles from Abingdon you could point to the birthplace of Freeborn Garrettson, and near to it the scenes of his conversion and of his early labors. In an opposite direction was the Deer Creek church, where the conference was held in 1777, at which the solemn parting took place between Mr. Asbury and his English brethren; and where the superintendent, Mr. Rankin, preached his last sermon before he retired within the line of the British troops then in possession of New York, and soon after left for England, never to return again to the work in America. Here too was the home of the Watterses, one of whom was the first American traveling preacher raised up among us; and lastly, the Bush Chapel, four miles off, and the second built in Maryland and America.

But apart from and independent of these considerations, Abingdon was intrinsically worthy of the distinction which was bestowed upon it. Its local scenery, to say nothing of anything else, was unsurpassed. Besides it was easy of approach, both by land and water, lying directly on the great continental road leading from the south and southwest, through Baltimore to Philadelphia and New York in the east, being equidistant nearly, at that day, from the two extremes of Methodism. Dr. Coke was so impressed with

these facts that, on a second visit to the place, after an absence of some months, he could not suppress the satisfaction which he felt in having some agency in bringing the college here. "The place," he says, "delights me more than ever. There is not, I believe, a point of it from which the eye has not a view of at least twenty miles, and in some parts the prospect extends even to fifty miles in length. The water part forms one of the most beautiful views in the United States; the Chesapeake Bay, in all its grandeur, with a fine navigable river, the Susquehanna, which empties itself into it, lying exposed to view through a great extent of country."

It was here, six months after Dr. Coke had given orders that the material should be procured for erecting the college building, that Mr. Asbury, on Sunday, June 5th, preached the foundation sermon, and of which he remarked: "I stood on the ground where the building was to be erected, warm as it was, and spoke from the seventy-eighth psalm, verses 4-8. I had liberty in speaking, and faith to believe the work would go on." Previous to the departure of Dr. Coke for England, fifteen trustees had been appointed, five of whom were from among the traveling preachers. The remaining trustees were chosen, not only for their high standing in the Church, and for their known ability for exercising the trust, but also from places sufficiently near to the college to make it convenient for them to attend the examinations of the students, which occurred "one full month" previous to the time of the annual commencement. The traveling preachers chosen to represent the college in the board of trustees were John Chalmers, Henry Willis, Nelson Reed, Richard Whatcoat, and Joseph Everett. Of the lay trustees, Judge White and James Anderson were taken from Delaware; Henry Ennalls and John Carnan, from the Eastern Shore of Maryland; William Wilkins, from Annapolis; Philip Rogers, Samuel Owings, Isaac Burneston, James M'Cannon, and Emanuel Kent, from Baltimore.

As it may be a matter of some interest to know what kind of a building Cokesbury really was, as a type of our infant literature, and over which the trustees now appointed were to exercise their paternal oversight, we have taken the liberty to transcribe a full description of it in the words of one who saw it in September, 1789: "The college," says Rev. John Dickins, "is one hundred and eight feet in length from east to west, and forty feet in breadth from north to south, and stands on the summit and center of six acres of land, with an equal descent and proportion of ground on each side. The whole building is well painted on the outside, and the windows completely glazed. The house is divided into rooms

as follows: at the west end are two rooms on the lower floor, each twenty-five feet by twenty; the second and third stories the same. At the east end are two rooms, each twenty-five feet by twenty; the second and third stories are the same. In the middle of the lower floor is the college hall, forty feet square, and over that, on the second floor, two school-rooms, and on the third floor two bed-chambers. At the end of the hall are square spaces for four sets of stair-cases, two at the north and two at the south end, with proper doors opening on the stair-cases. The carpenters' work on the first and second floor, with one stair-case, is almost completed. The plastering and painting of four rooms at the west are nearly finished; the school-rooms are also chiefly done, and one room at the west end partly plastered." Thus we have seen the progress made in the college building after nearly three years of unremitting effort on the part of its friends to bring it toward a final completion; having within its halls thirty students, ten of them wholly or partially supported on charity, several of whom were maintained, clothed, and educated gratis.

—We now turn to the internal affairs of the college, to notice its professors, in connection with the important duties assigned them, and what amount of success or of defeat marked their labors in carrying out the design of its founders. It appears that about the time the building was under roof, a preparatory school was opened with fifteen scholars, in charge of Mr. Truman Marsh, (a Quaker,) who had the reputation of being a good Latin scholar and an excellent disciplinarian. At the same time steps had already been taken to procure a suitable person to act as president. An appeal was made through Dr. Coke and others to Mr. Wesley to interest himself in the case, and finally a Mr. Heath was selected, as one altogether qualified for the place. As this gentleman's connection with the college was but of short continuance, and involved much at the time that was painful to his own feelings, as well as embarrassing to the institution, and also as creating a doubt with regard to the clearness of Mr. Wesley's judgment in recommending him for the place, we deem it but just to the parties interested, to give all the facts as they have come to us, leaving it to others to form their own opinion as to where the blame rests.

Mr. Wesley says in his Journal of March 22, 1787: "I had seen Mr. Heath before, a middle-aged clergyman, who is going over to Cokesbury College, and is, I believe, thoroughly qualified to preside there. I met his wife and two daughters here, who are quite willing to bear him company; and I think their tempers and manners, 'so winning soft, so amiably mild,' will do him honor wherever they

come." Mr. Heath, it seems, left for America the latter part of the summer of this year. In the *Journal* of Mr. Wesley, of August 5th, dated Birmingham, he says: "I took a tender leave of Mrs. Heath and her lovely daughters, about to embark with Mr. Heath for America, whom I hardly expect to see any more till we meet in Abraham's bosom." September, 1787, the first examination of the pupils under Mr. Marsh took place, in the presence of Bishop Asbury and other friends of the college; and in December the institution was formally opened by the installation of Mr. Heath as president, and the appointment of Mr. M'Claskey and Mr. Marsh as professors, the number of students being twenty-five. The occasion was signalized for three days by religious exercises, Bishop Asbury preaching a discourse each day: on the first from Psalm xxxvii, 3, "Trust in the Lord and do good;" on the second (Sunday) from 2 Kings iv, 40, "O thou man of God, there is death in the pot;" and on the third from Isa. lxx, 23, "They shall not labor in vain, nor bring forth for trouble; for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them."

Cokesbury College being now fairly begun, with its three instructors and twenty-five students, we hear of nothing material to its interest, except now and then complaints from Bishop Asbury of the difficulty of collecting funds for its support, until the autumn of the following year. It appears that the bishop had gone to the Bath Springs in Virginia for the benefit of his health, and while there had received letters from Abingdon respecting the college, the purport of which he gives in his usual ambiguous way. In his *Journal* of August 10th he says: "To-day I received heavy tidings from Cokesbury; two of our teachers have left, one from incompetency and the other to pursue riches and honors; had they cost us nothing, the mistake we made in employing them might be the less regretted." Who the teachers were that left, and what were the facts on which the good bishop based his opinion of the "incompetency" of the one, and of "the pursuit of riches and honors" on the part of the other, might have remained to this day a profound secret, had not a gentleman, who was himself a student in the college at the time, and one of the actors in the scene, politely furnished us with all the facts. It may not, therefore, be out of place to give a full history of the transaction, inasmuch as it violates no pledge of secrecy, nor can the disclosure, by any possibility, have an injurious effect upon the memories of the parties concerned in it.

It appears that Mr. Marsh, who had charge of the higher classes in Latin, had gone to visit some friends in the country, leaving it to the president, as a matter of course, to attend to the classes;

and it was remarked that his attention was engrossed exclusively by the junior Latin classes, such as "Cornelius Nepos," etc. It happened about this time, that Mr. Wesley sent over, for the use of the college, a work entitled "Selectæ Profanis, Scriptoribus Historia." This work fell to the lot of a young man from Philadelphia, and finding that his lesson was composed of certain passages too difficult for him to construe, made it necessary for him to apply for help; and as there was no one within his reach but the president that could afford the relief required, he made application to him, and was directed to study a while longer. Upon a second application, without affording him any satisfaction, he was put off until after the college exercises should be dismissed, but it seems the president never came near him. When the Latin teacher, Mr. Marsh, returned, the young man related to him what had taken place, when the affair was soon made public, and became the general theme of conversation throughout the college. Whereupon the president sent in his resignation. This excellent clergyman, for so he was esteemed by all that knew him, became rector of Joppa parish, which included Abingdon, and continued there for about three years, preaching with great zeal and usefulness, until some of his parishioners, thinking him too much of a Methodist, made his situation unpleasant to him, when he left for a parish at Port Tobacco, in the lower part of Maryland, where he remained for some time, and then removed to Virginia, where we lose sight of him altogether. Mr. Wesley, as a token of friendship, left Mr. Heath, in his last will and testament, sixty pounds. One of his "lovely daughters," Maria, resided in Charlestown, Virginia, for upward of twenty years, where she died, some years since, in the communion of the Protestant Episcopal Church, loved and respected by all who knew her. Mr. M'Claskey, the person referred to by Bishop Asbury as having left to "pursue riches and honors," purchased a farm on Gunpowder River, near Abingdon, where he settled, and soon after died. Mr. Marsh also retired, for what reason we are not informed.

Cokesbury being now deprived of its entire corps of professors, the first thing to be done was to supply the vacancies. Abingdon by this time had become somewhat of a place. So important indeed was it, mainly on account of the college being there, that it now claimed to share with Baltimore, in whole or in part, the privilege of entertaining the Conference, the first session being held here in July, 1787, and although much crowded, nevertheless the preachers were made comfortable. Mr. Toy, it is said, lodged twelve of the elders. The practice then was to commence the Conference first in

Baltimore, and adjourn over to Cokesbury to finish the business. In the Minutes for 1788, it was ordered that the Conference shall meet at Baltimore, Monday, May 4th; at Cokesbury, Saturday, May 9th: and in the Minutes for 1789, Baltimore, Monday, September 6th; at Cokesbury, Saturday, September 11th.

Merchants and mechanics found it to be their interest to settle here; besides, a number of gentlemen had come to reside in the place, some of them possessed of talents and influence, for the purpose of educating their sons. Among these was a Dr. Jacob Hall, who was prevailed on to accept the presidency. To Dr. Hall were added the Rev. John Hargrove, Rev. Joseph Toy, and a Mr. Tait from Georgia. In a year or two after, a teacher of French was brought from near Edenton, North Carolina. The new president, Dr. Hall, came into office with a fine reputation as a general scholar, particularly for a knowledge of Greek and Latin. Besides he was well known throughout the county, being a native of the state, and connected with some of its most influential families. Mr. Hargrove was an Englishman. He had been a traveling preacher for a year or two. During his connection with the college he changed his views of Methodism by embracing the opinions of Swedenborg, when he resigned his situation, and went to Baltimore, where he built the first "New Jerusalem Church" in that city. Mr. Toy was originally from New Jersey, where he was converted and became a local preacher. He was induced to move to Abingdon at the instance of Bishop Asbury, and was elected to Cokesbury on account of his knowledge of mathematics and English literature. Mr. Toy was a first cousin to the late Bishop White, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and was one of the purest men and soundest preachers known to early Methodism. Mr. Tate resided in the college building with his family. They had charge of the young men who were placed on the "charity foundation." He continued his connection with the college until its close, when he left for his native state, entered into politics, and was elected to the Senate of the United States. To this list of officials we must add still another, the Rev. Joseph Everett. Mr. Everett was stationed at Abingdon, and discharged the duties of chaplain to the college. He was one of the most remarkable men of his day in the Methodist Church. In his stronger points he resembled very much our excellent friend in the West, Dr. Cartwright. Mr. Everett is described by his biographers "as a flame of fire proclaiming the thunders of Sinai against the wicked, and the terrors of the Lord against the ungodly." He was bold and undaunted in the discharge of his duties: he feared the face of no man, but sought the good of all. He seemed to be the

personation of law armed at every point; "a terror to evil doers, and the praise of all them that do well." Many are the amusing anecdotes told of Mr. Everett while watching over the boys (so called) at Cokesbury College. Often, as the hour drew nigh for the Sunday sermon in the hall, it would be whispered round among those who had felt the smart of his rebuke: "Come, let us go and hear the old chaplain swear," alluding to his habit sometimes, while preaching to a promiscuous crowd, of characterizing sinners and in denouncing their notorious conduct, calling them "a hell-fired set."

Mr. Hargrove's preaching they could not endure. Two hours would weary the patience of a saint, and must have been no little punishment to students. "Simple-hearted Daniel Ruff," as Bishop Asbury called him, was the universal favorite. His sermons were always short, affectionate, and to the point. Nothing of special interest marked the first year of Dr. Hall's administration of the college, except an attempt to burn it, by putting fire into one of the closets, which was discovered by the students, and extinguished without doing any harm. Bishop Asbury, at this time, speaks of the young men as being promising for learning, but some of them wanting in religion. In the month of May, 1789, there is a gracious revival of religion among the students. Dr. Coke and Bishop Asbury speak of it with much satisfaction. It appears, on the morning of Saturday, May the 9th, Dr. Coke examined all the classes in private, and found that many of the students had made a considerable proficiency in the various branches of learning. And with their progress so well were he and Bishop Asbury satisfied, that on the afternoon of the same day they had a public exhibition of their respective improvements and talents.

"Two young men," he observes, "displayed great strength of memory and great propriety of pronunciation, in the repetition of two chapters of Sheridan on Elocution, and were rewarded by Bishop Asbury, as a small testimony of our approbation, with a dollar each. One little boy, a son of Mr. Dallam, a neighboring gentleman, delivered MEMORITER, a fine speech of Livy, with such a heroic spirit, and such graceful propriety, that I presented him with a little piece of gold. Three other boys so excelled in gardening, that Bishop Asbury rewarded them with a dollar each. But what is best of all, many of them are truly awakened. However, we were obliged to undertake the painful task, in the presence of the trustees, masters, and students, of solemnly expelling a lad, fifteen years of age, to whose learning we had no objection, but whose trifling, irreligious conduct, and open ridicule, among the students, of experimental religion, we could not pass over, as we were determined to have a college in which religion and learning should go hand in hand together, or to have none at all. But nothing relating to the institution, perhaps, has given me greater pleasure than to find that we are already enabled to support four students fully, and two in part, preachers' sons and orphans, on the charitable foundation."

In the year 1792 Cokesbury College had acquired such a degree of importance as to admit upward of seventy students within its walls. In addition to this, its reputation had excited so much attention, that several young gentlemen from the Southern states repaired thither to finish their education. To give it legalized respectability, some principal persons in the state informed its founders that the legislature were willing to grant an act of incorporation, that should enable them, under certain limitations, to confer degrees on the deserving. Accordingly a petition was sent the ensuing year to the General Assembly at Annapolis, which received the favorable consideration of that body, and an act was passed bearing date January 26th, 1794, "for incorporating the trustees of Cokesbury College." The charter sets forth, first, that the trustees may hold real estate to a limited amount; second, may have a common seal; third, may confer degrees, such as are "common to England and America;" fourth, the salaries of the professors shall not be taxed; fifth, the income of the college not to exceed three thousand pounds yearly in Maryland currency, to be reckoned in Spanish milled dollars at the present value and weight; sixth, no one can be an officer of the college without taking an oath of fidelity to the state of Maryland and to the United States.

The college being now placed on the same respectable footing as Saint John's at Annapolis, its friends were encouraged to believe that it had reached a point of security from which it was not likely in future to be driven, when unexpectedly it was ascertained that its finances were in a most embarrassed condition. Bishop Asbury says, in October 3, 1793: "I found matters in a poor state at the college; five hundred pounds in debt, and our employes nearly seven hundred pounds in arrears." And in October, 1794, he says: "I found the college twelve hundred pounds in debt, and that there were between five and six hundred pounds due us, three hundred pounds of which ought now to be paid." This was indeed a solemn crisis in the affairs of Cokesbury, to meet which required the united wisdom of the entire body of the preachers. Accordingly the case was brought before the Conference held at New York, September 28th, 1793, for a final determination. Bishop Asbury, when speaking of the decision of the Conference, says: "This has been a serious week to me. Money would not purchase the labor and exercise I have gone through. At this Conference it was *resolved that nothing but an English free day-school should be kept at Cokesbury College.*" Thus ended the flattering prospects and distinctions of our first college proper, forever!

In pursuance of the above decision, which it was thought would

be but temporary, the number of professors was reduced. Mr. Tate returned to Georgia, the French teacher was dismissed, and Mr. Hargrove had gone to Baltimore to attend to his New Jerusalem Church. The president, Dr. Hall, still retained a nominal relation to the institution, while Mr. Toy had charge of the school down to the time that the college was destroyed.

We now hasten to notice the destruction of Cokesbury College. "From what source," says Mr. Drew, "this calamity arose could never be ascertained. Dr. Coke supposes that it was done maliciously, so that the cause of its destruction remains a secret to the present time." There are those still living who were personally conversant with the whole affair, and who do not hesitate to name the person or persons guilty of the wanton deed. This is a subject, however, upon which we dare not allow ourselves to speculate or form an opinion, believing it best to leave the adjudication of so fearful a question to Him in whose sight the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed. The circumstances attending the destruction of the building are these: Mr. Everett, the chaplain to the college, who slept there for the safety of the property, had gone, on the morning of the 7th of December, 1795, into the country to see some friends, when, about twelve o'clock at night, the inhabitants were roused by the cry of the college being on fire. Nothing could be done to arrest the flames. In a few hours the stately edifice, with its valuable contents, consisting of the library, the philosophical apparatus, and many important private papers, was reduced to ashes. News of the unfortunate event was conveyed to Mr. Everett, who appeared on the spot early the next day, the picture of grief, and sat down near the ruins, and wept like Marius amid the desolations of Carthage.

The destruction of Cokesbury College was a matter of universal regret on the part of the community around: "The gentry," says Dr. Coke, "lamented the loss, not only from mere liberal motives, but on account also of the instruction and entertainment they had received in being admitted, by tickets, to the philosophical lectures of Dr. Hall, the president."

An account of the calamity reached Bishop Asbury while in Charleston, South Carolina, 1796, upon which he remarked: "I have now received a confirmed account that Cokesbury College has been consumed to ashes, a sacrifice of ten thousand pounds in about ten years. Its enemies may rejoice, and its friends need not mourn. Would any man give me ten thousand pounds per year to do and suffer what I have done for that house I would not do it. I wished for a school, Dr. Coke wanted a college."

To discover, if possible, the perpetrators of this deed, Governor Ogle offered a reward of one thousand dollars; but nothing could procure such information as was necessary to bring the incendiaries to justice. Two years after the trustees made application to the legislature for an act to sell the property of Cokesbury College, to pay debts for which they were personally bound.

In reviewing the past of Cokesbury College, the pure intention of its founders, the admirable principles upon which its regulations were established, and the beneficial effects that were expected to result from the institution, all of which we know did not preserve it from the common accidents which are attendant upon all human affairs, shall we therefore say that it was built in vain? What though the building was burned, and the principles which were inaugurated by the General Conference of 1784 were allowed to sleep for many years; the seeds sown at first were still alive in the "wonted fire" of Cokesbury, which germinated in after years, and reproduced more than thirty fold, mainly through that great man, Dr. Fisk, in the establishment of the Wesleyan University, and also through Bishop Emory, in our own Dickinson College; besides many others scattered all over the land. The direct, immediate good of Cokesbury College to the Church, and also to the country, was considerable. We have no means of knowing the whole; the records of the college are beyond our reach; but we know of some: Samuel White, son of Judge White, and one of the original trustees, was educated at Cokesbury. He became a captain in the United States' army, and was afterward elected to the United States Senate. Asbury Dickins, Esq., son of the Rev. John Dickins, Secretary to the Senate, and the oldest officer on the civil list of the country. Colonel William Doughty, from Philadelphia, was, for a longer time than any other man, naval constructor for the United States navy, where he acquired an ample fortune, and is now living retired in Georgetown, D. C. Dr. William Dallam, father-in-law to Rev. Littleton F. Morgan, D.D., is still living in Harford county, a true Methodist of the old school. As to the fruits of the college upon the traveling ministry, we just know enough to make us regret that we know so little. The mention of two names, however, will be sufficient to show that Cokesbury did not exist in vain. Who has not heard of the Rev. Valentine Cook, the most remarkable man of his day in the Methodist Episcopal Church, for learning and for success as a preacher? He entered the Baltimore Conference in 1788, and continued in the itinerant work for twelve successive years, traveling from Calvert circuit, in the South, to Tioga, on the Lakes, in the North, and from thence was sent to Kentucky, in the

West, where, "through weakness of body and family concerns," he was obliged to ask for a location. Mr. Cook was one of the four boys placed on the "charity foundation" at Cokesbury College, for whom Dr. Coke and Bishop Asbury expressed so much affection and concern. And also John Chalmers, Jr., son of the Rev. John Chalmers, whose name stands at the head of the list of trustees of Cokesbury. Mr. Chalmers joined the Baltimore Conference the same year with his school-fellow, Mr. Cook, traveled the same length of time, and desisted for the same reasons. He was a superior preacher, and greatly owned of God in his ministry.

The loss sustained by the burning of Cokesbury, and the destruction of the academy in Baltimore the year after, amounted to about fifty thousand dollars, a calamity which was enough to discourage any immediate effort for the continuance of a scheme which had been marked by such signal defeat. Still, we think that the very strong expressions uttered by Dr. Coke and Bishop Asbury on the occasion—That it was not the will of God, "now clearly expressed," for the Methodists to undertake such expensive buildings, nor to attempt such popular establishments, but that it was their duty to preach the Gospel, and apply such resources as were in their power to the more immediate means of calling sinners to repentance—were uncalled for, and that the effect which such opinions exerted for a long time was anything but beneficial to the Church at large. "On the same principle of reasoning," says Dr. Bangs, "we should refuse to build a church, or a dwelling house, or even to embark in any business, which might be injured by the elements. Job's repeated losses were permitted to try his patience, and this might have been permitted for a similar effect on the Church." As societies in other Churches, the work of calling sinners to repentance seemed to have been left by common consent to the Methodists, and in this they also seemed to stand in their providential lot. But when those societies ceased, by becoming an independent Church, the case was widely altered. Both duty and interest demanded that religion and education should now go hand in hand together. That God can make the machinations of wicked men an accidental occasion of good, and serve his gracious designs, in opposition to their own, is what no one will attempt to deny; but that the burning of a college by an incendiary is a "clear expression of God's will" that we should build no more, is a doctrine which we are not prepared to admit. This hasty opinion of these good men was destined to exercise an unhappy influence on the history of the Church; for many years Methodism, which has since proved itself to be a power in the land, was silent on the subject of

education, and was unheard in the control of the rising youth. Thus it is always true, that man may not pronounce with authority upon God's designs; he sees but in part, God sees the end from the beginning. The efforts that were then operative at Cokesbury have since been repeated at our other institutions of learning, and they now fill the land, multiplying with the increase of population, and meeting the demands of the age; giving scholars to the Church, both at home and abroad, and leavening society with a sound and pure, because a Christian literature.

ART. II.—DRUGS AS AN INDULGENCE.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

The Chemistry of Common Life. By JAMES F. JOHNSTON, M.A., F.R.S., etc.
Two volumes. New-York: Appleton & Co. 1857.

THAT human nature is really fallen is shown by the fact that every passion, every appetite, every propensity of man gathers strength at times to overpower his reason, and drive him on relentlessly to his injury, perhaps to his destruction. All sin is unworthy of him, and yet, to human eyes, all sin is not equally despicable. The ambition of Cæsar is a sin, but it is joined with vast intellect, and towers into the sublime of temptation and of wrong. We see that the victim of the lust of power is borne down by incitements to evil that come not with the same force upon all; and in contemplating his career we often admire while we deplore and condemn. But there are sins which befoul while they ruin, and whose every feature is ignominious. When we see men, in order to excite an unreasoning nerve, sacrifice intellect, conscience, honor, health, and usefulness in this world, and all that men hope for in the world to come, we wonder as well as censure, and are ashamed to own that humanity is so weak. To be dazzled by a splendid dream is bad enough, but it seems far more degrading to be ruined, immortal as we are, by that which we possess in common with the brute, and worst of all, when that which we share with the brute is perverted, and becomes unnatural.

To the latter class of temptations and sins belongs man's employment of intoxicating drugs as an indulgence. But let us digress at this point to inquire into the difference between a natural and an unnatural appetite. The human body is an animal engine, whose bands and wheels wear with every revolution. The particles

of matter of which it is composed change continually. Not a muscle moves but there results a loss, small, doubtless, but still a real loss of its material. A vigorous body, whose wants are supplied, will at once repair the loss. While one set of vessels gather up and carry off the worn out particles, another set select from the blood new particles to take their place, and thus there is no loss of weight or volume. The heart and the blood-vessels constitute an apparatus for distributing to every part of the system the nutriment which is elaborated in the stomach. The very atoms which the roots of the wheat have drawn up from the earth, or its leaves absorbed from the air, and of which the grain was formed, become bone and tendon, nerve and muscle, and thus God performs every moment, in each individual, the work of creation, and makes man out of the dust of the earth. We eat because we need a continual supply of building material. We drink because the process described requires the presence of a certain amount of liquid, and because moisture is constantly escaping from the pores of the skin. Food and drink, then, are two great natural wants of the body. In order that they may not be neglected, the sensations of hunger and thirst give warning when the supply of repairing material falls short. A natural appetite for food and drink, then, is nature's cry for help. Unperverted by disease, accident, or evil habit, these sensations are not felt except when there is a real want in the physical economy. When the tissues are wasting and the means of repair are not at hand, we begin to feel hunger; the idea of food occurs to the mind at first merely as an idea, unaccompanied by any definite physical sensation. If the want is not supplied, this idea occupies the mind and mingles with every other thought, and a strange uneasiness, which still seems to be mental rather than physical, is felt. In cases of starvation this uneasiness increases indescribably, and as the process goes on becomes painful, distressing, agonizing, maddening. Still there is no local pain, because the famine is universal. Every muscle, every nerve, every fiber feels it, and clamors for food. Under the influence of hunger like this men become savages, and rush eagerly upon the most loathsome food, and those who escape death the longest will even feed upon the bodies of their dead comrades, tearing their flesh like hungry wolves.

Men, however, create for themselves appetites unnecessary, irrational, wholly unknown to unperverted nature, and yet as tyrannical and remorseless as the raging hunger of the soldier famishing in the siege, or the thirst of the wrecked sailor, clinging to the ocean raft. When the Turkish opium eater wakes from the stupor which is the final stage of each debauch, he is wretched. His brain

seems on fire, and yet his limbs feel as heavy as lead. Gathering by degrees a little strength, he rises, swallows mechanically a little food, looks at the shadows of the morning, and thinks how long it must be before the time comes when he takes his daily dose. Incapable of engaging in either business or pleasure, incapable of all thought save one, he sits in sullen silence, watching the minutes as they wear slowly away. As the hour approaches, his longing for the drug becomes more and more clamorous, and his hunger for it rages like a famished tiger's thirst for blood. Could he obtain it in no other way, he would trample upon the bones of the prophet; he would plunge his hand into molten iron; he would rush after it if it were held over the mouth of Etna. Though torment and death come with it he must have his drug. And this is the appalling slavery to which all drugging habits tend to reduce their victims. The drunkard sees the ruin he is bringing upon himself, body and soul. He looks upon the rags of his children, and the tears of his heart-broken wife, and feels agonizing remorse. He would gladly reform, but the grasp of a fiend is upon him, and he is hurried along a way which he loathes, to a shameful death and an endless hell. All the substances described at length in the former paper on this subject are poisonous, all are intoxicating, and each of them is often the means of creating an unnatural appetite which proves a more cruel tyrant than the worst Legree of the most extravagant fiction.

No savage tribe is so ignorant as not to know, no land is so sterile as not to produce, some plant which may be employed to produce artificial mental states. The Hindoo chews his betel nut and pepper-wort. In the same way the Indian of the Andes chews his cud of coca leaves, and three or four times a day ceases his labor that he may revel in narcotic indulgence. "The inveterate *coquero* is known at the first glance. His unsteady gait, his yellow skin, his dim and sunken eyes encircled by a purple ring, his quivering lips, and his general apathy, all bear evidence of the baneful effects of the coca juice when taken in excess." These Indians also use the thorn-apple to produce intoxication, and fancy that in their drunken delirium they converse with the spirits of their deceased ancestors. The Kamtschatkan gets tipsy on toadstools, a poisonous fungus, which, collected in summer and dried for use, will intoxicate in a style equal to the "choicest liquors" of our most "respectable hotels." The Seminoles of Florida, before they had learned to use the alcohol of the white races, were accustomed to excite themselves to enthusiasm and even frenzy by means of tea made of the leaves of the *ilex vomito-*

ria, a species of the holly-tree. In Sweden it was customary, centuries ago, to add the leaves of a poisonous plant to the beer which they brewed, to render it more intoxicating and increase their drunken pleasures. The consumers of the five principal narcotics are estimated as follows:

Coca is used by.....	10 millions.
Betel "	100 millions.
Hemp "	200 to 300 millions.
Opium "	400 millions.
Tobacco "	800 millions.

But our principal business, in this article, is with tobacco, as the drug by which the readers of the *Quarterly* are most likely to be ensnared and possibly injured. Among the intelligent and the good the use of opium, hasheesh, or alcohol, for the sake of enjoyment, will have few advocates; but tobacco is an almost universal favorite. Men sit with the "Hasheesh Eater" in their hands, and read its pages dimly through the smoke of their cigars, marveling at the extreme folly of indulging in the resin of hemp. As the hour for the temperance meeting to begin draws near, the lecturer thrusts a double quid into his cheek and waits his inspiration. The Florence Nightingale of a village, in her benevolent itinerancy, visits the dwelling of the drunkard and reasons with him in regard to his habits, punctuating her sentences with pinches of snuff. Those who stand arrayed against tobacco, especially those who attack it on moral and religious grounds, are so few in number that they must be content, at least for the present, to be suspected of a degree of fanaticism. So much of this obloquy as may be involved in a brief, and we trust, fair examination of the claims of the popular idol, we are prepared to bear without a groan, especially as we are well assured that we have in our favor, from the start, the secret suspicions, if not the avowed convictions, of nine out of ten even of the most confirmed consumers of the drug in question.

According to the commonly received history, tobacco was first carried to Europe, from this continent, in the year 1559, by Hernandez de Toledo, a Spaniard, who found it in use among the savages with whom he had been trading. Later researches, however, render it at least possible that the inhabitants of China and the East Indies were acquainted with its use before its introduction from America. The name is said by some to be derived from *Tobasco*, the province of Mexico, from which the plant was imported; others derive it from *Tobago*, and others still from *tabac*, the Indian name of the rude pipe which the Spaniards found in use in Central America. Jean Nicot, the French ambassador at the

court of Lisbon, sent some of the seed home, as the means of introducing to his countrymen one of the wonders of the New World, a thing of marvelous virtue. Sir Walter Raleigh is said to have introduced the practice of smoking into England. He was ashamed of the habit at first, as was very natural, and consequently indulged in private, keeping the secret from even his own household. One day, however, a servant who had been sent for some beer came into the room sooner than had been expected, and seeing the smoke rushing from his master's nose and mouth, dashed the beer in Sir Walter's face, and ran out of the door, shouting for help, declaring that his master was all on fire inside and burning up. In 1589 the Cardinal Santa Croce, returning home from Spain to Italy, carried tobacco with him as a plant of great medicinal virtue. The impression seems to have been that the new remedial agent possessed almost miraculous power. No matter what was the disease, or of how long standing, the pipe could charm it away. As popular faith in the wonder-working power of tobacco increased, the use of tobacco spread among all who could obtain it. For years, however, the supply was small. The total amount imported into Great Britain in 1689, a century after its introduction, was only one hundred and twenty thousand pounds. In 1853 Great Britain consumed over thirty million pounds. For some time after it thus began to be used the price was high, and none but the wealthy could afford it. King James, in his famous "Counterblaste," denounces tobacco because of the large sums paid for it, "some of the gentry bestowing three, and some four hundred pounds a year upon this precious stink," a sum which, allowing for the change in the value of money, is equal to six or eight thousand dollars at the present time.

The folly and extravagance which marked the progress of the foreign weed soon brought it into disrepute among thinking men, and war was declared against it. James the First, in the book already alluded to, declares smoking to be a practice "loathsome to the eye, hateful to the nose, harmefull to the braine, dangerous to the lungs, and in the black stinking fume thereof neerest resembling the horrible Stigian smoke of the pit that is bottomlesse." Not content with a mere declaration of opinion against tobacco, his majesty, in 1604, the second year of his reign, imposed a heavy tax upon the imported article, and thus tried to lessen its use. In 1620 he issued another edict, commanding the planters of Virginia to devote their lands and labors chiefly to other crops, and prohibiting any one of them from raising more than a hundred pounds annually. Other sovereigns joined in the war. In 1624 Pope Urban VIII., and in 1690 Innocent XII., issued bulls excluding

from the number of the faithful and from the hope of heaven all who should use snuff in church. Perhaps these laws had their origin in the fact that public worship was much disturbed by ambitious people, who thought to build up a fashionable reputation by sneezing long and loudly in public places. Still, the threatened loss of heaven had little effect in staying the evil. The Russian government forbade the common use of tobacco on pain of having the nose cut off by the public executioner; but the smokers smoked on, retaining their pipes at the risk of their noses. Amurath the Fourth, of Turkey, even went so far as to make smoking punishable with death. But law, even in the severest form, failed to remedy the evil, and the war against it in high places soon ceased, because the sovereigns made the discovery that the tax on tobacco, which was borne by the people without a murmur, began to assume importance, and helped greatly to fill the royal treasuries. They deemed it policy to wink at a vice which to them was proving so profitable. In 1853 the imposts on tobacco brought over twenty millions of dollars into the British treasury; and at the present moment the income derived from this source forms so important a part of the national revenues of Europe, both insular and continental, that no government there could afford to lose it. Tobacco has traversed the globe, circumnavigating every continent, touching at every island and planting on every shore the standard of a conqueror. It sways its scepter over a greater empire than Alexander or Napoleon ever saw in their rosiest dreams. It rules its subjects with a rod of iron, taxing their property, their health, their usefulness, their happiness, every fiber of the body and every power of the soul.

The United States are foremost in the culture and the consumption of tobacco. For several years past the amount annually produced, has averaged two hundred million pounds, valued, in its raw state, at fourteen millions of dollars. An army of eleven thousand men, aided by water power and steam, are employed in cutting it for smoking and chewing, rolling it into cigars and grinding it into snuff. A portion of the crop, partly in its raw state and partly manufactured, is exported. That which is retained for home consumption costs the consumers at least twenty millions of dollars, a sum probably equal to the aggregate salaries of all the school teachers, college professors, and ministers of the Gospel, from Maine to Mexico and from ocean to ocean.

But what is tobacco? Why do we use it? What effects does it produce? Is the habitual use of it a good and wise thing? Should its votaries continue the indulgence, and those now strangers to it acquire the taste and form the habit as soon as practicable?

To the eye the plant is like a small sun-flower plant, save that it has small blue blossoms, instead of the broad, honest yellow ones of the other. Commercially it is an article of great importance, worth eighty or a hundred dollars per hogshead. Financially it is an enormous tax upon the pockets of nations and individuals. Socially it forms a bond of brotherhood among one class of the community, and to the rest it borders on a nuisance. Chemically it is composed of the ordinary elements, except that every part of the plant contains a peculiar principle, to which the odor, taste, and effects are owing. By distillation this peculiar principle may be extracted from the woody fiber, and appears as a "volatile, oily, colorless alkaline liquid, which is heavier than water, and to which the name of *nicotin* has been given. It has the odor of tobacco, an acrid, burning, long continuing tobacco taste, and possesses narcotic and very poisonous qualities. In this latter respect it is scarcely inferior to prussic acid, a single drop being sufficient to kill a dog. Its vapor is so irritating that it is difficult to breathe in a room in which a single drop has been evaporated. The proportion of this substance contained in the dry leaf of tobacco varies from two to eight per cent." (Johnston.)

Besides this volatile alkali there are two other active elements peculiar to tobacco. When the leaves are mixed with water and distilled, a very small quantity of fatty matter comes over and floats upon the surface of the water. "It has the odor of tobacco and possesses a bitter taste. On the mouth and throat it produces a sensation similar to that caused by tobacco smoke. When applied to the nose it occasions sneezing, and when taken internally it gives rise to giddiness, nausea, and an inclination to vomit."

The third substance is formed when tobacco is burned in a retort or in a common pipe. This is an empyreumatic oil, which is a virulent narcotic poison. "One drop applied to the tongue of a cat brought on convulsions, and in two minutes occasioned death. The Hottentots are said to kill snakes by putting a drop of it on their tongues. Under its influence the reptiles die as instantaneously as if killed by an electric shock. It appears to act nearly in the same way as prussic acid."

These three poisons, or three forms of the same poison, are always present in tobacco, and act upon the consumer with more or less directness and power, according to the mode in which he employs it. The *narghileh*, or long Turkish pipe, in which the smoke bubbles through a vase of water on its way to the mouth, is the mildest way of indulging that form of the habit; the cigar and the short metallic pipe are the worst. The chewer escapes the action of the

essential oil formed in the process of combustion, and, other things being equal, suffers less from a given quantity of the drug. Other things being equal, the tobacco user who discharges his saliva most freely while chewing or smoking will feel the least effect.

In regard to tobacco as an article of *materia medica* we do not know that we can quote a more reliable authority than Professor Wood, of the University of Pennsylvania. In his lectures on the various substances employed as remedial agents, he classifies *digitalis*, *prussic acid*, and *tobacco* under the head of "nervous sedatives." These are "medicines which, in their primary operation, reduce at the same time the nervous power and the force of the circulation. All of them obviously affect the functions which belong especially to the brain, and rank with those medicines usually called narcotic. They are applicable therapeutically to complaints attended with nervous disorder and unhealthy exercise of the heart and arteries." In the "*Materia Medica*" of Drs. Wood and Bache, a standard work, it is thus described: "In its action on the animal system it is one of the most virulent poisons known. A drop of it in the state of concentrated solution was sufficient to destroy a dog, and small birds perished at the approach of a tube containing it," being killed by the mere vapor. The same authors add that when employed as a medicine tobacco should be used with great caution, as it has in several cases, even when administered by a physician, caused the death of the patient. One case is mentioned. For some affection of the skin a child was bathed with the juice pressed from tobacco leaves, and death soon followed. It must be borne in mind that these effects are not only produced by the distilled oil, but by the mere leaf, and by the tobacco as it goes into the pipe of the smoker or the mouth of the chewer. A single leaf, soaked in water and bound upon the chest, causes the most distressing nausea and vomiting. Certain Indian tribes poison their war arrows with the oil, and those wounded by them sometimes die in convulsions. Quotations from medical works could be multiplied to any extent to show that tobacco is a poison. On this point doctors do not disagree. Still our business is not so much with tobacco in pills and plasters as with the tobacco habits of the day. It must be confessed that medical testimony in regard to tobacco as a remedial agent is rather dark against tobacco as a luxury. If a leaf laid upon the chest makes a man vomit, it would seem unwise for him, without a very substantial reason, to grind the leaf into powder and snuff it up his nose, or put it into his mouth and chew it, or roll it up into a cigar and smoke it. Let the experiment be tried by one whose system has not been corrupted by its use, and

the immediate palpable results show it to be poisonous. A very few puffs create a giddiness of the head and a tremor of the nerves which declare the presence of an enemy. Let the daring experimenter continue to puff, and the symptoms of physical distress grow more decided until the seeker of knowledge under difficulties is sick, as he thinks, unto death. The muscles are relaxed and powerless, the face is livid, the breathing is labored, cold drops of sweat stand upon the forehead, and the victim of experimental philosophy pants in an agony of nausea and loathing indescribable. After the lapse of an hour or two the effect ceases, and the new smoker revives, perhaps to laugh at, as a good joke, the sickness which God designed to be a warning. Take now the same person, ten years afterward, a confirmed devotee of tobacco, consuming five, ten, or fifteen cigars a day. Suppose him to return home at night, after a very busy day, during the last five or six hours of which he has not tasted food, drink, or tobacco. He is weary and hungry, perhaps nervous and irritable, but the appetite which he feels most sensibly is the appetite for tobacco. He eats his supper in haste first that he may smoke at his leisure afterward. The meal being over he seizes his pipe or cigar, and the first three puffs give him more apparent pleasure than the needful wholesome food which preceded it. His satisfaction grows as he continues to smoke. His nerves sink into a delicious quiet, his fatigue is remembered no more, the cares and perplexities of the day fade into the distance, and his whole being, body and soul, yields to pleasant repose. The whole man, in fact, is under an influence which is only one of the milder forms of intoxication. Such are the effects of smoking, as nearly as we can ascertain them. We confess that we have found it difficult to learn what are the elements of the pleasure experienced by the habitual user of tobacco. The initiated seem not to be able to analyze their own sensations, or else there is a very general unwillingness to reveal them to an outside inquirer. It will be safest for us, therefore, to keep in view the undisputed effects of tobacco when employed as a medicine.

To return, then, to our medical authorities, tobacco is a "nervous sedative," whose effect is "at the same time to reduce the nervous power and lessen the force of the circulation." We infer, therefore, that the "delicious repose" which constitutes the chief charm of tobacco, arises from the fact that the whole system feels its influence, and that the nerves are less sensitive and the beating of the heart is less frequent and strong. The tobacco user, like the consumer of alcohol and opium, feels the power of his drug in his whole being. Will he doubt this assertion? When he seizes the cigar

or the quid so eagerly, after a few hours' abstinence, what is the nature of the gratification which he seeks? Does he do it as he eats a peach, or chews a piece of cinnamon, because the taste is agreeable? Not so. His nervous system has become accustomed to the effect of his drug, just as the opium eater and the consumer of alcohol have become habituated to theirs; and he craves his unnatural gratifications on physiological grounds but little removed from theirs. They need to be stimulated, he narcotized. In the cases of all three their drugs have perverted their nervous systems, and created artificial wants, a need of those drugs, and without them they are all three unnerved, spiritless, and miserable. Deprive the inveterate consumer of alcohol, the opium eater, and the user of tobacco in any one of its forms, of their poison, and they are alike weak in body and wretched in mind, and their nerves are so shattered by a few days' abstinence that they are on the verge of insanity. We have known one case in which tobacco produced effects bordering on the *delirium tremens*. These facts speak a language which ought not to be misunderstood. They show that it is not the mere taste of tobacco, but its narcotic effect upon the whole system, which gives it its wonderful power to charm and enslave. We have been told, in all apparent sincerity, and sometimes with tears, by the victims of this drug, that they could not give up the practice. The unnatural appetite is so despotic, the agonies of reforming so terrible, that their reason, their self-regard, and even their conscience, were unable to stem the torrent. No; it is not the mere sensations produced in the nerves of taste which make the craving for tobacco so remorseless. It is the power which it possesses of so subjecting the system to its sway that without it life seems impossible.

Some may fancy that this description of the difficulties of reform is overdone, and that even the farthest gone may easily retrace his steps. Though all the reformed may not suffer the same horrors, the picture has not a single shade too deep. The idea of an easy return is one of the delusions which throw their flattering light along every evil path. We cannot know the power of a habit till we resist it. The dog fastened to the axle of his master's wagon never knows the strength of the chain that binds him till he pulls back. A gentleman of worth and intelligence, an unwilling victim, who has tried more than once to be free, but is still a slave of the drug, has assured us that he would gladly give money, and give liberally, to be rid of the habit, but that the remembrance of the failures already made deprives him of the courage to attempt again. Some reform for a time, and after weeks or months of abstinence

the undying appetite for the old indulgence overthrows their strong resolutions and they fall. Who would bow his neck to a yoke of iron? Who would so bind himself, soul and body, to a poisonous drug that without it life becomes weariness and religion itself yields no joy? If any, the drug is before him, and numberless respectable examples on every side.

Assuming, as we surely may from the foregoing, that tobacco subjugates the whole physical system, reducing it to the most abject dependence upon its enslaver, the question still remains, What is the immediate visible result of each indulgence? Again we return to our medical authorities. Digitalis, tobacco, and prussic acid are "nervous sedatives," whose property it is to "reduce the nervous power and the force of the circulation."

But, as we have seen, muscular force, as well as mental and emotional power, depends upon the circulation, and that when the heart beats feebly and slow, neither mind nor body is capable of great efforts. The immediate effect of a segar, then, is to lessen the inclination and the capacity for vigorous action. As the smoker inhales the volatile oils from the burning tobacco, and falls gradually under their influence, he gives indisputable evidence that his whole system is relaxed. He inclines to a lounging position, to stretch out his body horizontally, and lift up his feet, so that every muscle may be relieved from tension, and the whole frame yield readily to the narcotic repose. For the same reason the emotional susceptibility is lessened. Care, sorrow, and wrong have less power to irritate and distress, because, by the action of the drug upon the nerves, and through them upon the mind, the feelings are rendered unnaturally obtuse. In the same degree in which muscular and emotional power declines there is a loss of mental power. Where the habit is inveterate and excessive, and the susceptibility of the narcotic influence great, and the cigar or the pipe is smoked vigorously, there will result an almost total suspension of thought. Thus as the drug "reduces the nervous power and the force of the circulation," the brakes are applied to body and soul, and energy of every kind declines with the falling pulse. There are, doubtless, cases in which this result is less marked than in others; but the exceptions in regard to tobacco are no more numerous than in the case of other drugs, whose physiological effects are equally peculiar and definite. Some consumers of tobacco speak of the *excitement* which they think that it produces in their systems; but if the drug be a "nervous sedative," no such primary result can follow. Their impressions upon the subject can be accounted for in either of two ways. Their tobacco may be adulter-

ated, as it sometimes is, with some stimulating drug, to which the exciting effect is due. The probability is, however, that they apply the term "excitement" to the mere pleasurable sensations which they experience, and which in reality originate in the decline of cerebral and arterial activity.

Having thus briefly set forth the chemical nature, and, so far as we can ascertain them, the peculiar effects which constitute the charm of tobacco, we would, with the modesty which becomes those who stand in the minority, propose a question or two for the consideration of those who are yet uninitiated into the arcana of the drug.

First of all, we would ask, is it right thus to tamper with the mysteries of our nature? The object really aimed at is a pleasurable state of mind to be attained by laying the nervous system under the spell of a poisonous drug. The enjoyment can hardly be called sensual. The victim of alcohol swallows his dose, and in a few moments the sensuous pleasure is gone. But after the nerves of taste have ceased to recognize the flavor of the liquor, the higher nature feels the power of the drug, and mental and emotional action is greatly modified. There is an exhilaration, an elevation of the spirits, which lifts the soul out of its abysses of sorrow and care, and lends it wings for a flight above the level of earthly shadows. These wings are indeed but the waxen device of Dedalus, and, melting in the sun, they plunge the soul into seas of darkness and floods of woe. Still while they last they bear on bravely. Hasheesh and opium act in the same way, still more powerfully. The votary of tobacco, who comforts himself with a cigar or a pipe, employs means of much the same nature, philosophically considered. They all seek a pleasant frame of mind, not in communing with God, not in the vigorous normal action of the intellect, not even in lawfully meeting natural wants, but by subjecting the nervous system to the action of drugs. Is it right thus to disturb the regular workings of the mental and emotional nature? Is it right to interpose a prism between reason and fact, even though the vision be beautiful? Has the Creator, in adjusting our nature to our outward circumstances, and one part of our nature to another, so erred that we may lawfully hurry on this, or retard that wheel of his clumsy machinery? Is it right, now to intensify our emotions, now to deaden them by artificial means? And seeing that the effects desired never follow, except when drugs which are unquestionably intoxicating are employed, are not the influences experienced, whether much or little, whether exciting or soothing, really and truly *intoxication*?

Is all this morally allowable? The bodily states affect the men-

tal and moral condition. A nerve, the fourth of an inch long, and no thicker than a hair, becomes diseased, and the result may be that a man, otherwise hopeful and energetic, becomes timid and dispirited. Lay the nervous system under the power of a certain drug, and the mind is driven to preternatural activity, the fancy glowing with an inspiration before unknown, and the soul reveling in an ocean of visionary joy. Substitute another drug for this, and the animal nature is chiefly affected, and every appetite and passion possessed in common with the brute is clothed with new power and new excitability. Employ another drug still, and body and soul sink into a strange repose, the body becoming listless and inert, and the mind floating off in vague and meaningless reverie. Is all this right, if practised as a species of self-indulgence? Why shall no drunkard enter into the kingdom of God? Is it because, in walking, a right line is morally better than a zigzag course? Or is it because the drunkard, by means of his drugs, wilfully disturbs the relation of body and soul, and gives up the immortal to the mastery of the material? This seems to us the worst element of the vice, and the parent of the rest. It is the abuse of the nobler nature. It makes the servant a master, and the master a slave. It wrests the reins from Hector's hands, and drags him in the dust behind his own chariot. And wherein does drugging with alcohol differ from drugging with tobacco? We admit that the tobacco intoxication is milder and less dangerous to the individual and to others; still, is it not intoxication? The action of the mind is disturbed in the one case as in the other, and in both the thing aimed at in the indulgence is to create, by means of drugs, a pleasurable state of the mind. The substances employed in both cases are poisons, and, quantity for quantity, tobacco is far more deadly than alcohol. Is it right, then, in the case of tobacco, any more than in the case of alcohol, to seek, in the region and shadow of death, outside of natural wants and natural supplies, for something to create artificial repose of body and fictitious exemption from anxiety and trouble?

Again: This repose is the result of a reduction of mental and physical activity. Is it right for us thus to throw away, deliberately, a part of our energy and efficiency? If tobacco "reduces the nervous power and the force of the circulation," it also reduces the general vigor, lessens the number of the ideas, the depth of the emotions, and the inclination to bodily motion, and makes a man practically smaller in every respect. To prove that the use of tobacco wastes the natural forces, we appeal to its votaries themselves. Do we not often hear men say that they use it to prevent

their becoming too fleshy? And how does it accomplish this? It does it by impairing the appetite, and by creating a perpetual waste of saliva. The excessive secretions which it causes are as sure a drain upon vitality as a severed vein would be. If a man is robust, with a strong tendency to accumulate flesh, he may endure it for a time; but the thin nervous man will soon show the tokens of failing power. Those organizations upon which the habit fastens most readily and firmly are most liable to be injured. The first apparent effect will be seen in the languid movement, the lack of physical energy, which is apt to mark those who indulge excessively in tobacco. A votary of the drug may succeed in life, but he does it in despite of his habits; and were this clog thrown off, this prodigal waste of vitality stopped, soul and body would be stronger, purer, brighter, capable of more, better fitted to act life and enjoy life, than when thus impeded.

It is hard to see how the habit of using tobacco in any form can fail to be deleterious. As has been shown, tobacco is a powerful poison, soothing, gently intoxicating, stupefying, or destroying, according to the degree in which the system is under its influence. How can the system be subjugated by a poison, and go unscathed? The process of poisoning may be certain where it is slow. Mithridates, of old, fearing that his enemies would attempt to poison him, accustomed himself gradually to the various deadly drugs then known, and after a time found that he could bear a dose that would have killed him when he began the process. He lived to be eighty years of age, yet will any one doubt that his drugs shortened his life.

Veteran consumers of tobacco may be found, and so may veteran drinkers of alcohol, but the existence of the former proves no more than that of the latter. The strongest apologist for tobacco will admit with all readiness that excess is injurious; but who shall draw the line that divides excess from moderation? To what extent may a man place his brain and heart under the narcotic influence, and for how many hours daily, and how much of the drug shall he be allowed to consume in the process? What shall be the criterion of moderation? If you allow a certain weight of tobacco per day, and declare that this quantity must never be exceeded, the system of the consumer will in time so adjust itself to the quantity allowed as to lessen the narcotic effect. The "delicious repose" of the body and the dreamy reveries of the mind will be less marked, less pleasurable, as the nerves become less susceptible of the intoxication, and finally the tobacco user has little motive to continue the practice, except that he is all unnerved and miserable without it. If we adopt the other rule, and say that to be narcot-

ized to a certain degree, so many hours daily, is moderation, then the quantity must be increased from time to time. Every consumer of the drug feels this tendency to increase the quantity. Here and there one detects it at an early stage of his career, and lays down rules for his own guidance, and by self-mastery adheres to them. The vast majority yield. It is characteristic of all drug-ging habits that they naturally grow. Of bread, and beef, and water, a man may consume no more this year than he did last year, and yet his wants are as well supplied. Of alcohol, opium, and cerebral stimulants generally, Dr. Woods remarks: "Their influence is diminished by habit more rapidly than that of any other class of medicines. It is necessary gradually to increase their dose in order to obtain from them the same impression." Let the smoker or the chewer, who has progressed in the ordinary way for ten years, suddenly return to the quantity which he found abundantly sufficient for him at the end of the first year of the ten, and he will acknowledge that the remark quoted above is applicable to tobacco as well as alcohol and opium. How the habit increases is obvious. Suppose a man is accustomed to smoke one cigar every evening; in ordinary circumstances he finds it sufficient to quiet his nerves and lull mind and body to dreamy repose. But let him be peculiarly troubled or irritated, and one cigar is not enough to produce the degree of narcotization which he desires, and to which he is accustomed, and another must be lighted. Sometimes the example of others who are farther advanced in the habit, and whose society he enjoys, encourages him to proceed. And worst of all, as the victim of alcohol or opium loves the effects of his stimulus and increases the quantity that he may plunge more deeply into his unreal joys, so the consumer of tobacco loves his more gentle intoxication, and is tempted to seek a fuller tide of enjoyment. Where, then, shall the line of moderation be drawn? But suppose this difficult task performed, where shall the seeker of narcotic joys find the wisdom and the strength never to pass the line? Shall he depend on his own native decision of character and self-control? Alas! daily observation, if not experience, renders the prospect in that direction not very full of promise. Venturing upon perilous ground for the sake of needless self-indulgence, will he pray to the Strong for strength? Who would dare approach the throne of heavenly grace with so doubtful a prayer? Who would kneel and say, "Lead us not into temptation," and then deliberately rush into it with his eyes wide open?

Our whole supposition is a fallacy. No line can be drawn to separate rational Christian indulgence in tobacco from irrational un-

scriptural excess. Of the use of the drug as a medicine, by those who need it, we say nothing; but employed to secure narcotic enjoyment, we confess that tobacco seems to us too dangerous a thing, and the purposes for which it is employed too nearly allied to those for which alcohol is used, for it to escape arraignment on moral and religious grounds. But whatever may be our opinions in regard to the practicability of fixing a limit both theoretically and in practice, all will admit that excess is by no means uncommon, and that many are thereby injured. The ill effects are most visible when boys of only ordinary strength of constitution become excessive smokers and chewers. They soon become languid, inert, inefficient, indisposed to physical exercise, as well as hard mental labor, and consequently less successful as students, and less useful as clerks and apprentices, than they would otherwise be. And all who use the drug freely are liable to be injured.

Johnston makes the following quotation from Dr. Prout, whom he styles an excellent chemist, and a physician of extensive medical experience, whom all his scientific cotemporaries held in much esteem:

"Tobacco disorders the assimilating functions in general, but particularly, as I believe, the assimilation of the saccharine principle. Some poisonous principle, probably of an acid nature, is generated in certain individuals by its abuse, as is evident from their cachectic looks, and from the dark and often greenish yellow tint of the blood. The severe and peculiar dyspeptic symptoms sometimes produced by inveterate snufftaking are well known, and I have more than once seen such cases terminate fatally with malignant disease of the stomach and liver. Great smokers, also, especially those who employ short pipes and cigars, are said to be liable to cancerous affections of the lips. But it happens with tobacco, as with deleterious articles of diet, the strong and healthy suffer comparatively little, while the weak and predisposed to disease fall victims to its poisonous operation. Surely, if the dictates of reason were allowed to prevail, an article so injurious to the health and so offensive in all its modes of enjoyment would speedily be banished."

But we will not multiply authorities to prove facts which few will venture to deny, nor will we repeat the common arguments against tobacco habits founded on their cost in time and money, and their offensiveness to those not addicted to the same. These things, and more, are left for the consideration of those who, after reading this article, shall feel, as many may, that the subject ought to be more fully examined before they finally settle the question in regard to what is lawful and best in their own case. To this investigation we leave them, not only hoping that they will reach the right result in theory, but wishing them great success in conforming their lives to their logic.

In the early days of the Wesleyan societies the Methodist trum-

pet blew no uncertain sound in regard to tobacco. The preacher in charge of a circuit was directed "as soon as there are four men or women believers in any place" to "put them into a band," and "see that every band leader have the rules of the bands." The directions given the band societies December 25, 1744, contain the following: "You are supposed to have the faith that overcometh the world. To you, therefore, it is not grievous:

"I. Carefully to abstain from doing evil; in particular

"1. Neither to buy nor sell anything at all on the Lord's day.

2. To taste no spirituous liquor, no dram of any kind, unless prescribed by a physician."

"7. To use no needless self-indulgence, such as taking snuff or tobacco, unless prescribed by a physician."

The preachers in charge were directed to enforce "vigorously, but calmly, the rules concerning needless ornaments, drams, snuff, and tobacco." When a new "helper," or preacher, was received he was asked before the Conference: "Have you faith in Christ? Are you going on to perfection? . . . Do you take no snuff, tobacco, drams?" The seventeenth question and answer in the Large Minutes read thus:

"*Quest.* Have those in band left off snuff and drams?

"*Ans.* No. Many are still enslaved to one or the other. In order to redress this, 1. Let no preacher touch either on any account. 2. Strongly dissuade our people from them. 3. Answer their pretenses, particularly curing the colic."

At the Christmas Conference of 1784, when the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized, all legislation on the subject of tobacco was repealed, except the band rule against it, and in 1792 that rule was also repealed. Whether this retrogression is to be attributed to a secret love of the drug among the preachers themselves, or to the acquisition of light not possessed by Wesley, or to the difficulties in the way of enforcing the rules, it might not be safe for us to decide. Nor will we even conjecture the fate of the Church if the rule had been made general, and rigidly enforced, whether Methodism would have been stronger and purer than it now is, or whether its commission to "spread holiness through these lands" would have become null and void. One thing, however, seems tolerably clear, if the habit of using tobacco is commendable among Christians, our Church ought to cease publishing tracts against it, and strike out No. 127 from the list.

ART. III.—THE MORAL THEORY OF THE BIBLE AND OF
PHILOSOPHY HARMONIZED.

THE paradox between moral philosophy and theology lies in this: that the former restricts the moral region exclusively to the action of the will, while the latter extends it to the thoughts, sensibilities, and physical functions, nay, even to the undeveloped capacities and tendencies of our entire nature. Moral science ascribes the moral quality of the actions to the intentions, that is, to the choice of what the conscience approves or disapproves; not to the ideas of it, nor the feelings respecting it, nor to the overt acts; these have in themselves no moral character whatever, and are absolutely incapable of it; all the right or wrong in any wise applicable to them is to be traced to the volitions, and properly belongs to the volitions alone. The Bible, on the other hand, not only attributes right and wrong to the intentions, and even goes so far as to blame us for doing what God has not forbidden, provided we think it wrong, or even doubt that it is right, as in eating meat that had been once offered to idols; but it also declares that we "are by nature the children of wrath," and that "death passed upon all men for that *all* have sinned," and accounts for it by our descent from Adam: "As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners." Now, here is an apparent contradiction between science and revelation! How can we reconcile them? Here is the problem of ages, and far more important than that of reconciling the discoveries of geology with the Mosaic account of the creation; for that has troubled only the learned, and those who are so situated as to read the rocky records of the pre-Adamite world; but this has perplexed all serious minds, and is perpetually pressed upon the attention by the ever varying aspects of our experience. Miss Catharine Beecher, in her work, "Common Sense applied to Religion," has expressed the agonized feelings of thousands who have tried in vain to understand these mysteries by the aid of popular theological systems: "*There must be a dreadful mistake somewhere, but I will trust, and obey, and wait quietly for light.*"

It is often contended that moral science is superseded by revelation. This is true, whenever the direction of revelation is beyond science; but not when it seems to come into collision with science. Many truths we should expect inspiration would disclose which could not be discovered by reason; but then science is founded on facts and formed by strict induction; it admits of no contradic-

tion; the evidences of inspiration and the principles of interpretation cannot establish a biblical theory or a theological dogma any more firmly. One belief can never be abandoned for another, but they must be held separately, until you arrive at the means of reconciling them. To do otherwise, to suppress the evidence of reason and experience, because it seems to invade some cherished religious creed, has always the effect of disgusting thoughtful and observing men with such a creed, and, in many minds, endangers the credit of religion itself. It would better serve the Christian faith, if the principles and canons of interpretation were rigidly tested by reason, and especially that nothing should be allowed as a proper rendering of Scripture which is contrary to common sense. Common sense, the intuitive universal judgment of mankind, is the first and last principle of interpretation.

But is the science of morals, as above stated, well established by induction? Let us see. In every instance of action, if we analyze our experience, we shall find a conception of something to be done, attended by certain emotions and desires appropriate to it, also by ideas of right or wrong, and the corresponding emotions of approval or disapproval and feelings of obligation; then comes the volition to act; then follows the nervous and muscular motion, if it be an overt action; or if it be a mental action, as reckoning up an account, the series is completed by the mental operation. Now, in all these phenomena, there is no such thing as liberty except in the volition alone; all the other operations, mental and physical, are necessary. The thoughts come and go by the unalterable laws of association or suggestion; the emotions and feelings are spontaneous, the nerves and muscles are governed by a vital mechanism; all these obey their appropriate antecedents; they have no alternative. But when the volition is put forth it is with the conviction, clear to your consciousness as the volition itself, that you might have made an opposite choice. Here then is liberty: it is an attribute of the will, and it is nowhere else.

Equally clear in every mind is the conviction, the intuitive belief, that guilt or innocence, merit or demerit, attaches to the volition. Here, then, certainly, both reason and revelation find the moral region; but the moment you go beyond, reason dissents, and for no other cause but the absence of liberty. Liberty then is the *sine qua non*, the indispensable condition of the imputation of virtue or vice to our experience and conduct. If at any time we speak of thoughts, and feelings, and overt actions as right or wrong, it is only as they are dictated by the free will. If the intention exists, the moral movement is complete, whether the mental or physical

phenomenon obey the will or not. But without your choice, and especially against your choice, no temper, or affection, or train of thought can have any moral character; they have no more merit or demerit than the beating of the heart or the burning of a fever. If any doubt this, and attach blame to what is born in us and not subject to our choice, nor in any wise possessed of the attribute of liberty, let him consider whether it be not the prejudice of sect or creed. Let him bring the question home to his reason, and if it be not contrary to his intuitions, then his mind is of a peculiar order. What! blame a babe for inborn tempers prompting him to act, and prior to any intelligent volition! Regret you may feel for him and pity; but you can no more impute to him merit or demerit for such a mental constitution than for being born with a scrofulous or scorbutic body. This is as much an intuition and just as certain as any axiom of mathematics, or the principles that lie at the foundation of the inductive sciences.

But is the will free? This has been controverted. It is controlled by motives, it is said; and an appeal is made to consciousness and to the principle of causality.

All that we are conscious of, it is argued, is each state of mind in succession, when on a perception of an object and an excitement of feeling we put forth a volition, we are conscious of that volition, that choice; we cannot be conscious that we might have made an opposite choice, for the consciousness takes cognizance of what is, not what might be in the operations of the mind. This is strictly true, and is a complete answer to the argument from consciousness as it is commonly stated; but it is not so stated above. I said that in every instance of volition we are conscious of a conviction that we might have chosen differently. This conviction is an intuitive belief; it is ever present in the mind at the time, and is as clear as the volition itself. These intuitions are the absolute measure and ground of certainty; nay, they are certainty itself; for what is certainty to the human mind but the highest form of belief, absolute and necessary belief. Therefore we may say, in the strongest terms we know, that we are free in our volitions; we know that they are not the necessary consequents of thoughts or feelings of any kind called motives. It is admitted that we never choose without a motive, for this would be to choose nothing: we feel, moreover, that motives are often very powerful; they seem *almost* irresistible by the will at times; but never altogether irresistible, until the mind is crazed and completely wrecked.

As to the argument that here is an event without a cause, we answer, not so; the will is the cause of its own volitions; it is the

mind in its absolute sovereignty putting forth volitions, on the occasion of motives, freely preferring one to another. It is true that when the motives are of the same kind it usually elects the strongest; but the motives of passion are always mixed with moral motives; and when these are opposite there is a proper alternative, because there is a difference in kind between the moral and the pathematic sensibilities. This alone, according to Dr. Hickok, constitutes the ground of liberty in the human mind; and it must be admitted that it is sufficient for all purposes of moral responsibility, inasmuch as the sentiments of right and wrong are always present on every occasion of action. Still, I think it is not the whole ground, for when the moral considerations are the same, and the other motives for and against a certain decision are of unequal strength, though we usually prefer the stronger, we still feel that we might have chosen the weaker; though in that case we should convict ourselves of folly; but of folly we are often conscious.

We now understand what is meant when it is said the moral quality of the action lies in the intentions. Intentions are frequently defined as motives, or the objects or ends we have in view; but this is an inadequate definition; they involve something more than motives or ends, namely, the choice of them; not choice alone, but the choice of motives to govern our action. When is an intention right? When the choice is in accordance with the idea of right, as given by the moral judgment, or conscience; and it is wrong when contrary to the conscience. Thus, it is wrong to intend harm to any one, or to intend to gratify yourself at the expense of another's rights. Why this is wrong no answer can be given, but that the moral reason intuitively and necessarily so affirms. Now, it is not sufficient that a man should have good or bad motives, that is, impulses at war with his conscience or in harmony with it, to render him virtuous or vicious; he must elect them to govern his action, and until his choice is made he is not a subject of praise or blame. But suppose the man has been badly educated, or suppose he has rejected evidence, and has come to a mistaken judgment of the rights of his fellow-men or the claims of God. His duty is to rectify his judgments, if he suspects them to be erroneous; but if he is without such suspicion, his duty is to choose according to his present knowledge of right and wrong. Reason forbids him to do otherwise. Shall a man do what he thinks is wrong? Never. Dr. Wayland, in his excellent text-book of Moral Science, at the outset lays down the principle that the moral quality of a man's acts resides in the intention; but in a subsequent chapter in respect to virtue in imperfect beings, forgetting his main

principle, he makes a man responsible at every moment, not only for what he knows of duty, but for what he might have known had he improved every opportunity to learn his duty. His error lies in confounding past time with present. In the case supposed, the man was responsible to act according to evidence when it was presented, and his guilt was great indeed when he set it aside; but now that he sincerely thinks he knows his duty, to require him to act contrary to his belief is to pervert the doctrine of intentions, and to make "confusion worse confounded." Then two men, one of whom had improved the knowledge he received, and the other misimproved and perverted it, would at the present moment be equally innocent in opposite courses of conduct! Strange as this conclusion seems to our philosopher, his original doctrine of intentions obliges us to adopt it. But, mark, it is only of the present intention and its moral character we speak. Historically the two men are widely apart in their moral character, but the guilt of the bad man must be charged to him when he perverted evidence, and it was immense; but now, when he would do his duty, will you condemn him for the attempt? Is it wicked for him to intend right? What more has the good man done at any moment than to do as he thought right?

It may be thought that this inextricable confusion, as the consequence of wrong action at the outset, is its just punishment. If it be so, then probation at that point should come to an end. It is unjust, in the view of reason, for a man to be tried and condemned for what he cannot help. Ability to do or to forbear is the just measure of accountability. It is absurd and cruel in the extreme to require of a man according to what he hath not. This notion of Dr. Wayland is a common one; but I think it makes a man's probationary state more dreadful than hell itself, for in hell we behold no such spectacle as that of a lost mind lifting itself up against the surges of seeming evil, and vainly striving to rectify itself on the principle of right, and by that very effort plunging itself into a deeper abyss of guilt and woe. The sentiment of hell is what Milton makes Satan express: "Evil be thou my good;" and this, on Dr. Wayland's suggestion, might not only turn out to be the best policy but the best morality!

Much confusion will be removed from the whole subject of moral agency and responsibility by considering what constitutes a just probation. A probationary state is one in which the righteousness of a rational being is tested by the conflict of passion with conscience to result in appropriate rewards or punishments. A just probation requires that the person under trial should not only pos-

ness a free will, but a proper adjustment of the pathematic and moral sensibilities; for it must ever be borne in mind that though the will is free, of its very nature, yet motives have great influence on it; never, indeed, so great as to be irresistible, but often so great as to distress the mind, and in extreme cases to create a mortal agony. Precisely what that adjustment should be, none but the All-wise God could determine; but reason would require that, if the passions were very violent, the conscience also should be very powerful. Were a being to have by nature such an adjustment of the passions and moral feelings as that, though possessed of a free will, he would, in fact, always choose to act wrong, we should say that this must be a malformation of his nature, a moral depravity, and to such an extent as to make it altogether unreasonable and unjust to keep him in a state of probation liable to severe penalties; and if this were true of his whole race, we should say the race must be depraved by nature, and so depraved as not to be in a condition to undergo a fair trial. If any one should occasionally and for a brief period be put on trial with such a moral constitution, or in any way more perilous still, he should have ample opportunity to reverse his wrong decision, and under more favorable conditions. Without such relief, how much would his probation differ from a state of retribution? To make heaven secure to the righteous, it is not necessary to destroy the free will of the redeemed. That can never be destroyed but by the destruction of his rational nature. It is only necessary to make the balance of motives greatly and perpetually in favor of virtue. No man feels himself in danger of going to the top of his house and throwing himself off, and yet he is free to do it. In hell, likewise, we may suppose, no loss of free will spreads despair over the realms of evil, but only the absence of suitable motives to repentance. Free agency, therefore, is not sufficient to make probation just; there must be a proper distribution of the active powers. A probation without a sufficiency of favorable motives would be just as abhorrent to reason as a probation without liberty itself.

As it regards retribution, we may remark, that reason requires that it should be measured in degree or in duration by the nature of the trial, that is, by the difficulty of choosing right. In an important sense the duration of rewards and punishments must be endless; for a single opportunity for virtuous action misimproved leaves the soul forever destitute of attainable perfection, just as a single lesson neglected leaves the scholar forever so much short of attaining the knowledge which was once possible. It must also in degree be severe enough to give sanction to the law and to support its authority, without being so terrible in anticipation as to be too power-

ful for the will, or even to eclipse the moral motive, the sentiment of duty. The mind must be so influenced in a state of probation that it will choose right for the sake of right, or it can never attain to virtue. Reason abhors the doctrine that future punishment can be such, in its nature or circumstances, as to involve the condemned in the necessity of going on in sin, and consequently increasing in misery. When retribution takes place the precept of the law is suspended by the penalty, and no longer applies as in a state of probation. What regimen the condemned may be under, will be suited to their capacity and condition, and the observance or violation of it will be followed by appropriate consequences; but this is a new order of things. How absurd, in a state prison, to punish a man for not attending muster, or working out his tax on the highway, since he is placed in a condition where such service is impossible! Civil law with him is in fact suspended, and applies to him only as to its penalty, and such precepts as are suited to his state. If he violate the rules of the prison, let him be punished for that; but anything more is the height of cruelty and tyranny. It is from not considering the difference between a state of probation and a state of retribution, that theologians and preachers have pictured a hell so full of horrors as to exceed the hyperbolic license of poetry itself, and from its ever deepening abyss of torment to send up a smoke to cloud and stain the throne of Infinite Justice.

Such in its outlines is the moral theory, derived from reason and based on psychology in its present advanced state. The mind of man is so contrived that, whatever be its outward circumstances and antecedents, it has within itself a proper theater for the trial of virtue; for there is in every human being in this world a moral reason presiding over all his actions, and pronouncing them right or wrong; impulses of passion and conscience contending for mastery, and a sovereign and free will to make the momentous arbitrament. How human nature came to be what it is in its moral powers and phenomena, is beyond the power of reason to discover; for that we must look to revelation.

Much as the moral theory of the Bible seems to differ from that of science, they will be perfectly harmonized by a liberal construction of the doctrine of general redemption, and by a just distinction between moral right and wrong and legal right and wrong. The law was made for a perfect humanity in a state of probation. It required a perfect development of that humanity in all respects, directly demanding nothing but the obedience of the free will; but indirectly a perfect exercise of all the faculties, mental and physical, because it would naturally and completely follow the exercise of right voli-

tions. But man, being tried by an object which excited natural desires to do what, after the Divine interdiction was known, the conscience forbade, freely chose to yield to his passions, and become at once conscious of guilt. He therefore fell under the penalty of the law, which was death; but, behold! grace intervenes and restores him to a probationary life. Now in order to make the new probation a blessing and not a curse to him, it behoved the grace of God to do one of three things: to restore the ruined man to all his original and perfect capacity to obey the law; or to abolish that law, and substitute another adapted to his fallen nature; or, leaving the law as the standard of perfection and the rule of life, to provide resources whereby man might ultimately attain to perfection, and in the mean time to accept his voluntary reception of those resources and earnest endeavors to obey the law, in lieu of a perfect obedience. The latter is the scheme of salvation revealed in the Gospel. "For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." St. Paul to the Romans, viii., 2, 3, 4. "The grace of God which bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works." St. Paul to Titus ii, 11, 14.

These texts, properly expounded, and fortified by other passages, which will readily occur to every person familiar with the Gospel, but which the space allotted to this article will not allow us to quote, teach us that man, recovered from the prostrating power of the law, is restored to moral agency, so far as to enable him to make a perpetual endeavor to keep the law, and to avail himself of the provisions of grace to atone for the past and to aid him for the future; but the law, standing as a rule of life, though no longer as a condition of salvation, condemns everything contrary to its own perfect requirements. Man, therefore, being left imperfect, except in the power of choosing the right, when it is made known to him, is under legal condemnation; but from this he is justified, so long as he wills and does what he is enabled to will and to do by the assistance of grace. The offspring of Adam, partaking of his fallen nature, are under the same legal condemnation; for the law approves

of nothing but perfection; but from this they are entirely justified, and without conditions of any kind, prior to the period of life when their understanding of God and duty is so developed as to make it proper to hold them personally accountable for their voluntary disobedience. "As by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Romans v, 18. The justification here is just as extensive as the condemnation. The grammar of this passage, and the scope of the argument, forbid a different construction. Infants, therefore, hold the same relation to the government of God, without faith, which adults attain through faith. On this ground they are entitled to baptism and membership in the Church. This is not saying that they are regenerated, for observation shows that a child does not spontaneously love God, even after he has adequate knowledge of him, as he loves his parents and other kindred, though, by Christian culture and God's blessing thereon, he may attain to it, prior to the period of accountability. If he dies an infant, he will receive regeneration and sanctification, and whatever else is necessary for a state of perfect moral order. At present he is under no condemnation but a legal condemnation, and from that he is justified by grace.

What is there in this distinction which is unreasonable? In civil life the law is made for all, young and old, wise and ignorant; and everything contrary to it is a legal offense; but a just magistrate will pardon every unavoidable violation of it, committed through ignorance or by necessity, remitting the penalty entirely, or leaving only so light a penalty as the public order may require and justify. If children, by the fault of their parents, are found in violation of the law, they are legally condemned, though no just magistrate would pronounce them morally guilty, or punish them as such, prior to their voluntary and intelligent adoption of the predicament of legal transgression in which their parents had placed them. Here, then, is an obvious distinction between morality and legality. Similar distinctions are familiar to moral science. Dr. Wayland makes a distinction between right and wrong, and guilt and innocence. "Right and wrong depend on the relations under which beings are created, guilt and innocence depend on the knowledge of their relations." (*Moral Science*, p. 91.) Also, in the chapter on "Veracity," he remarks: "Moral truth consists in our intention to convey to another the conception of a fact, exactly as it exists in our own minds. Physical truth consists in conveying to another the conception of a fact precisely as it actually exists. Those two do not always coincide. I may innocently have obtained an incorrect con-

ception of a fact myself, and yet may intend to convey it to another precisely as it exists in my own mind. Here, then, is a moral truth, but a physical untruth." (*Moral Science*, p. 276.) Precisely analogous to this, the Scriptures contemplate the offspring of Adam as legally condemned and graciously justified; and these terms are employed, instead of the philosophic terms, "wrong" and "innocent," to conform to the mixed system of law and grace under which man is born.

The distress which good and great men, like Edwards, have felt in view of the depravity of their nature, even after conversion, is now easily explained. They viewed it in the light of a perfect law, and, by mistake of their theology, they implicated themselves in the guilt of it. A man who has discovered that he has uttered a physical falsehood, in an emergency involving life and property, as in the case of mistaking signals at sea, will feel a deep distress; but his distress would be insupportable if he allowed himself to think that his unavoidable mistake was criminal. In like manner an artist feels the deepest mortification because he does not realize in his creations the beautiful ideal of his genius, though compared with other men's, his works are praised as models of the art; but how intolerable would be his chagrin at times if he attached a moral character to his short comings. You can never get at a true theology from the experience of the wisest and best of men. A false philosophy, like that of Edwards, which confounded the will and the affections, or a creed derived by a perverted interpretation of Scripture, will color all their experience to their view, and cast a shade of Divine wrath over passages in their lives on which God smiles, as showing the vigorous and sublime struggles of a noble will against the mighty currents of violent passion, over which the moral victory is achieved when it is defied, and its dominion over the conduct repelled. These tendencies of our nature are incompatible with a state of perfect order; they must be subdued and brought under the easy control of the will; but their existence and violence, so far from being imputed to us as crime, furnish rather the occasion of the loftiest virtue. Hence the wisdom of God has left them in us after conversion, that our complete sanctification may be the achievement of our own minds inspired by grace.

This view explains also those passages of the Scriptures in which men, prior to conversion, are described as "dead in trespasses and sins." They refer to our nature considered as under the law, and aside from grace. Such, after the fall, mankind would have been had it not been for grace; but mark you! there would have been but just two of them, and the race would not have been propagated. But now a totally depraved man on earth is one of the

myths of the pulpit, for total depravity in a state of probation is a moral impossibility; it furnishes no basis for a trial; in short, both Scripture and consciousness reveal in man moral power to do all that is required of him in order to acceptance with God, though not immediately all that the law originally demanded. The legalist who has not received the good news that Christ will accept the will for the deed, will be often in an agony of disappointed endeavor, as described in the seventh chapter of Romans, for he will perpetually find that his power to will and his power to do are at variance. And yet his defeat and despair may teach him, if he has good sense, what are the bounds of his actual obligations; he will find a light in his own mind respecting the terms of his probation. Thousands of men, who have never heard of Jesus Christ, have said, as the conclusion of their unsuccessful efforts to subject their thoughts and feelings to their ideal of duty and moral excellence: "Well, if I cannot do what I would, I will do what I can; and God be merciful unto me!" To all such there comes complete relief when the Gospel is preached unto them, for now they know that God is merciful to man upon those very terms; for there is no other condition of salvation.

I do not for a moment forget that faith in Christ is the only condition of salvation to those who hear the Gospel, for I understand St. James to teach that all genuine faith involves the principle of all good works. Faith is no talismanic act that has a potent spell within itself; it is no technical, positive, arbitrary requirement; it is the first and natural duty of all who have proof that Jesus is the Christ. Hence repentance is sometimes set forth as the sufficient condition of salvation; for repentance, implying regret for all past wrong, and a purpose to do right in future, will lead to faith in Christ, just as soon as his character and relation to the sinner are understood. The real principle embraced in all the Scriptural statements of the conditions of salvation will, upon analysis, be found to be universal right intention, choosing right because it is right. Hence Jesus says: "Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple." On this sole condition, God's grace in Christ Jesus our Mediator and Redeemer, is justly and properly bestowed on all men under every dispensation, and to every degree of salvation in order—justification, regeneration, entire sanctification, and eternal life. Christ having made satisfaction to the law, it is now proper to bestow upon the penitent pardon for all past offenses and the remission of their penalty; this is justification. At the same time, it is proper and necessary to inspire the soul with the love of God, which, coming in aid of the conscience, will

enable the will to have dominion over the passions; and this is regeneration. When experience shows the difficulty with which this dominion is maintained, and realizes that a more perfect adjustment is desirable, then, in answer to prayer, an increase of the power of love and of the conscience may be granted, so as to give them easy and peaceful ascendancy over the adverse passions; and this is entire sanctification. This being wrought in the heart, there only remains to be accomplished a maturity of all the sentiments favorable to virtue, and an enlargement of the understanding to apprehend all the relations and obligations belonging to our sphere, to render the soul angelic in moral excellence, and to entitle it to the removal of every test of obedience; which being done, the soul is secured in eternal holiness and happiness. If to any one this looks like salvation by works, let him remember, that it is by grace that man has this new probation, together with all the moral power to meet its conditions, and therefore, if we attain to any merit, that merit is itself the fruitage and glory of grace.

Taking this view, we see that the evangelical system is the same in principle with that which reason deduces from the facts and phenomena of our moral nature; and that salvation, so far as our agency under Christ is concerned, though it is not by the works of the law, which would be impossible after a single transgression, is nevertheless on the principle of the law, inasmuch as it requires that every one should do right as far as he has capacity; and the law was in the beginning founded on no other principle. "In every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him."

How much better is this interpretation of revelation than those unevangelical, rationalistic theories, which have sprung from the reaction of Augustinianism, rejecting the distinctions and phraseology of St. Paul as if they were not inspired, and substituting philosophy for the deeper revelations of Scripture. Such theorists can never attain to a profound experience of holiness, because they are unconscious of the degeneracy of their nature, and know not how to repair it. On the other hand, how unspeakably better is this view of man's moral condition, than that old divinity which makes out of the legal construction of it a frightful predicament of total depravity, subject to unlimited responsibility, and dooms the soul to perdition, as a just punishment for being related to a guilty progenitor; or, what is worse, as a display of Divine sovereignty, decreeing and making a depraved nature, capable of no virtuous action, and fit only for destruction; or that paradoxical modification of it, which allows to man natural ability to obey the law, but denies him moral ability; or, in other words, allows man a free

will, but not of sufficient energy to resist the perpetual violence of passion at war with conscience. Or that recent modification of it, called new divinity, which, without making any different adjustment of passion in relation to conscience, decides that this disorder in the sensibilities is not depravity, and therefore, though the result is, that all men do choose wrong and "sin in all the appropriate circumstances of their being," it is no reflection on the justice of the Creator for having given them such a moral constitution and placed them in a state of probation; a doctrine which, while it is right in supposing that blame can only be attached to voluntary action, and has had a happy influence on the popular mind, and saved it from a radical reaction from evangelical religion, has, nevertheless, in its main positions, neither Scripture nor philosophy to support it; for the Scriptures do say that man is inherently depraved, and has no natural ability to keep the law; and philosophy declares that a will invariably governed by evil motives is proved, *a posteriori*, to be either without liberty, or subjected to such impulses as to unfit it for a state of probation; and, furthermore, that such a moral malformation is depravity.

The doctrine of general redemption relieves every difficulty, and the conflict of ages ceases. Instead of shuddering at the moral order of our world as instituted by God since the fall, we admire it. It is just such a world as God could wisely and justly create by an act of power, without the intervention of a fallen progenitor, and without the necessity of a divine Mediator; albeit, in such a case, the law given for its government would not be a law of absolute perfection, but adapted to the capacity of its subject. The presence of the perfect Adamic law in our fallen state is all that creates our moral difficulty. Why it was not set aside as a standard of duty when man was preserved in a deteriorated nature to pass through a new probation, we may not be able to say. Some great and good men take this view, and consider the Gospel as a law of liberty substituted in its place. But this is not Scriptural. Christ declares: "I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill." Standing no longer as a condition of life and salvation, but as a rule of life, it answers as a perfect ideal of moral excellence, and presents at once a monument of the original greatness of our nature and an index of its future glory; it reveals the evil of sin in its nature and consequences; makes a grand lever of reform in the individual and in society; shows the glory of Christ as a Mediator, whose cross is seen in bold and brilliant relief upon its dark and lurid background, and impels us to him by all the power of an awakened conscience and of adoring gratitude.

ART. IV.—RELIGIOUS CATALEPSY.

CERTAIN mysterious phenomena have been occasionally witnessed in connection with religious emotions and exercises, consisting in suspended motion and consciousness. These phenomena have either been held as completely inscrutable, or accounted for as differently as were the mental culture and moral character of those who have passed judgment upon their nature and cause. If the person witnessing such examples, and who attempts to solve the difficult problem, is himself truly pious, embracing in his own mental constitution a strong element of the mystical and the superstitious, he will probably resolve the whole matter into the immediate power of God. This to him is an ultimate truth, admitting of no explanation. He will therefore neither seek nor desire any thing further.

But should he be of an incredulous temper, one whose views of experimental religion have been hastily and crudely formed, and which are consequently without much scope or analysis, he will resolve the whole thing into blank delusion, feigned impositions, or mere excitement growing out of surrounding circumstances. Or, from a mingled feeling of prejudice and repugnance, persons of this stamp may be ready to construe this mere accompaniment of religious exercise, but constituting no part of its essential character, into a formidable objection to all experimental religion, as if glad to meet with such examples of total or partial paralysis, and make them the occasion of downright mockery and scorn of Christianity itself; thus bringing the whole system into contempt and ridicule.

Others may feel as if the key to those undeniable facts which they have frequently witnessed, could it only be obtained, is a most important desideratum. Distinguished more perhaps for sincerity than deep and earnest reflection, being better Christians than philosophers, they ardently desire to experience "the power," as it is often termed, simply to satisfy their own curiosity as to its mysterious nature. These constitute, probably, the leading views which have currency in the community on this subject, and on which, as such, very little within our knowledge has ever been written. Hence, unless we misjudge, it is a subject worthy of more consideration than it has hitherto received.

But that any attempt which may be made at a philosophical analysis of those peculiar affections, will not be open to objection to some minds, is perhaps more than there is reason to expect. Cher-

ishing the tenderest and most sacred regard for the cause, some will be ready to look upon any such attempt as a sort of profane intrusion into the "holy of holies," fearing it will be construed to the prejudice of existing confidence in the presence of that Divine influence in the Church on which they justly regard its vitality and success to depend. All such fears are wholly groundless. True philosophy and true divinity cannot be antagonisms. They are so regarded only by those who mistake the true character of one or the other, or of both. All truth flows from the same eternal source; it must, therefore, be in harmony with itself. To all enlightened Protestant minds a greater heresy cannot be promulgated or cherished, than that "ignorance is the mother of devotion." Hence, to an intelligent, sober, inquiring mind, the grand question on this subject is, "What is truth?" On what hypothesis should those cases of suspended consciousness and motion occasionally witnessed under religious emotions and exercises be resolved? To this question any intelligent solution, which shall be candidly proposed, should be heard and weighed with at least equal candor, whether it prove satisfactory or otherwise. This is all we ask for the views which follow.

We have entitled the marvelous phenomena, into whose nature we propose to inquire, religious catalepsy. The term catalepsy is used by medical writers to express a peculiar form of disease, consisting in a suppression of sensation, motion, and consciousness, when the subject is senseless, speechless, and remains fixed in the position in which he was when the affection seized him. The etymology of the term sheds some light upon its radical import, whether applied to a form of disease, or, with the prefix *religious*, to designate the peculiar affection under consideration, when it is assumed nothing morbid is involved. It is derived from *kata* intensive, and *λαμβάνω*, to seize, grasp, lay hold of. This is strictly true of the subjects of religious catalepsy, who in ordinary are suddenly seized with a partial or total suppression of consciousness and motion, which state continues with little or no variation while they are under what in common parlance is termed "the power." But we repeat the remark that nothing morbid or in the slightest degree prejudicial to physical health is assumed to attend or result from this sort of paralysis.

By way of anticipation we might here observe that we assume the cause to be, not simple, but mixed, consisting remotely, and perhaps in the largest degree, in the peculiar physical temperament of the subject. Its immediate cause in most cases, not in all, doubtless is the agency of the Holy Spirit producing the given result through the peculiar physical temperament just named, in connection with

sympathy and strong mental impressions; so that the cause may be summed up thus: remotely the physical temperament, together with the moral, intellectual, and sympathetic elements combined. In most cases, where the work of grace is deep and genuine, the moral element is doubtless immediate and paramount, touching all the responsive and yielding, though latent, susceptibilities in the mental and physical constitution of the subject, which, as so many constituent elements in the cause, combine to produce the result witnessed.

As the cause is of a mixed character, the result, partaking of the nature of the cause, is also mixed, though doubtless, in some cases, the physical and the sympathetic greatly predominate over the intellectual and the moral. For who can doubt that the physical effect of the Holy Spirit upon a congregation is contagious through mere sympathy, while conscience remains but slightly awakened? This is said discarding all design to disparage the gracious and powerful influence of the Spirit, which, like "the wind, bloweth where it listeth." It is said in allusion to the philosophy of the phenomenon in question, as we may judge from results which follow, especially upon the unconverted; of which more hereafter. So much as to the general character of the hypothesis on which we suppose the phenomena under consideration to be resolvable. Let us next inquire into its basis, together with some of the facts and circumstances which usually concur in actual examples of religious catalepsy.

That man is not only a compound, but a complex being, is a mere truism to every one who has duly reflected upon his own mental and physical constitution. The recondite link which connects the immaterial actuating spirit with the material organism, is too subtle to be a matter of intelligent speculation to the profoundest metaphysician or physiologist. Those who have penetrated the farthest into the secrets of nature are and should be content with a recognition of this inscrutable fact, without attempting an *exposé* of its nature. Nor is it strange if, based upon this vital union of the material and immaterial constituents in man's compound nature, we should meet with vast complexity in the action of mind upon body, and *vice versa*. So much at least as will tend to foil our most earnest attempts at strict analysis, and our greatest efforts to distinguish between the mental and physical in the phenomena witnessed in the affection under consideration; enough, indeed, to exclude from any hypothesis which may be chosen as furnishing a solution of the mystery involved, everything which savors in the slightest degree of dogmatism.

From the conceded fact no longer called in question that the brain is the organ of mind, as a firm stand-point, or perhaps it were

better to say starting-point, let us not slide off into the empty chimeras of phrenology, whose base, as far as it respects sound philosophy, is so narrow, that the superstructure, as such, "topples to its fall." This our limits forbid us to stop to show, which, despite some things urged by its votaries in its support which may claim a degree of speciousness, we believe it would not be a difficult task to do. Our only object is to present certain data as the basis of the hypothesis on which it is believed the phenomena in question may be resolved.

Let it be remembered, then, that this organ consists of two compartments, as physiologists inform us, called the *cerebrum* or front brain, and the *cerebellum*, or back brain. In volume the front brain is said to be much the larger. This compartment is supposed to be the organ of the understanding, will, and other active mental powers, while the back brain is held to be the seat of the passive mental susceptibilities, into which department ideas are received by sensation through the medium of impressions made upon the outward senses, and thus affecting the nervous system. These ideas thus received through the perceptive faculties, supply the raw material, so to speak, of thought, reason, judgment, for the exercise of the active powers, whose seat is in the front brain. On this theory, for whose truth, as such, it is not necessary to vouch, but which seems entitled to rank with other brain-theories, and to contend for dominance till superseded by another more plausible, the back-brain is the seat of all our intuitional and instinctive ideas or perceptions. These instinctive and intuitional perceptions are so many passive susceptibilities, which are not in the slightest degree dependent upon our will, judgment, or reason. And between these two mental departments, with their respective organs, the active and the passive, there is the closest intimacy, the most perfect harmony, and mutual reciprocity consistent with their distinctness and comparative independence. To a certain extent one may act without the other, or when the other is to a great degree eclipsed or suspended. How little, for example, do we see of the purely instinctive and intuitional when the active powers are intently employed in an intricate process of reasoning! On the contrary, how many things have we done from birth, and every day still do, from mere instinct, without reason, will, or intelligence! Besides, are not the mental powers called active, and which are under the control of the will, suspended and in a state of rest during sleep? And is it not equally clear that none but the voluntary or active faculties, both physical and mental, either seek or admit of cessation or repose from the constant discharge of their appropriate

functions? Were the involuntary physical powers to take a recess for a single hour, it would be fatal to the physical organism. And were the passive susceptibilities of the mind to do the same thing for any length of time, all conscious connection with the material world would be during such period completely suspended. That there is a most vital connection between these passive susceptibilities and the nervous system, and that the former operate and manifest themselves through the latter, are facts too obvious to be questioned.

Hence, it must follow as an inevitable consequence, that the more delicately strong the nervous system is, the more impressible, by just so much, must such persons be, whether through Divine agency operating through the conscience, the imagination, the animal spirits manifested in our association with and sympathy for each other, or from any other cause whatsoever. For this reason alone, as a general rule, the gentler sex outvie the stronger in nervous impressibility, as the natural consequence of their more delicate physical organism. This perfectly harmonizes with the indisputable fact that the subjects of religious catalepsy among the former greatly outnumber those among the latter. Reasoning from the theory on which it is believed this phenomenon may be resolved, this is just what might be expected. But were the reverse as to this proposition true, it would seem to constitute an objection to the theory which, as the fact is, promises to furnish the key to this mysterious affection.

Such is a glance at some of the leading fundamental principles of the proposed theory, on which, it is believed, the phenomena under consideration may be explained. Space precludes a more full and detailed presentation. And if the ground occupied is tenable, it would be useless; if untenable, it would be worse than useless. But it should be borne in mind, that while the cause of this phenomenon is more or less mixed, in connection with its influence upon the subject, certain *antecedents* usually both precede such effect and promote its realization. The mind may be the medium through which the body is affected, and possibly, though it must be the exception and not the rule, the body may be first affected, and thus become the medium through which the mind is influenced, which thus reacts upon the body. But when physical paralysis takes place through a physical medium, it follows that the effect is purely physical, not moral, even though the cause is moral. But the person whose antecedent mental conception or exercise usually supervenes between the cause and the phenomenon, is in an abstractive, meditative state. And while we admit and contend for the largest direct Divine influence upon the whole man, which is warranted by Divine teaching, still in

cases of religious catalepsy, why may we not believe that this very influence may induce that antecedent mental state just named? When the cause is not divine, this antecedent mental state, from some other cause, is not only conceivable, but seems absolutely necessary to the result.

To illustrate: Let us suppose a religious assembly to be before you. A sermon, or series of them, followed by appropriate exhortations, have been delivered. The well-directed aim in all has been to produce immediate effect, and to rouse to immediate moral action. To this one point all the showings and appeals have been directly aimed. The attention of the audience has been strongly arrested. The feelings are wrought up to the highest state of tension and excitement. In this, of course, some individuals greatly surpass others; but all generally sympathize together. The prayer-meeting immediately ensues. All here, we will suppose, is marked with faith, zeal, ardency, and earnestness. May we not suppose that the mind in a sense loses sight of things material and visible, and becomes absorbed in those which are invisible, spiritual, and moral? The prevailing mental mood is eminently meditative and abstractive. Here, then, we have the antecedents of religious catalepsy. But who are the subjects of this affection? Are they those whose active mental powers are in the most lively exercise? Probably not; for this would of itself be sufficient to prevent their becoming subjects. Are they not those who are in a mental state directly the opposite; that is, meditative, abstractive, lost to what is active, and overwhelmed as the passive subjects of an oblivious, pervading influence? Admit the presence and influence of the Spirit, is it not also true that, while mind sympathizes with mind, so does body with body? Is it not also true that, as far as any nervous influence is wielded, or is merely prevalent, that the weaker in nervous power yield to the stronger? And does not this shed some light upon the fact that the wicked as well as pious, are sometimes paralyzed at the same time? How well are such reigning sympathies, such surroundings, such mental associations, adapted both to produce the phenomenon in question, and to suggest the philosophy it involves. The active powers are in a sense overborne and eclipsed; and consciousness itself, in those most deeply affected, seems to retire into the passive susceptibilities. The subjects continue in this state for a longer or shorter space. At length suspended consciousness and physical paralysis subside, and, physically, all are as before. But is this true also morally? This is a most important question in connection with this peculiar phenomenon. Such is the complexity of our compound nature, and such the mys-

tery of the Spirit's operations, while doubtless all its influences are in harmony with the existing mental and physical laws of our nature, that we may well say with John Angel James: "We cannot usually distinguish between the influence of the Spirit and the operations of our own minds; nor is it necessary that we should. We cannot tell where man ends and God begins; nor ought we to trouble and perplex ourselves about this matter."*

If this is true of the ordinary operations of the Spirit to which this writer professedly alludes, how much more is it true of his extraordinary operations? On the one hand, no good man would, knowingly, derogate from the agency of the Holy Spirit in the work of grace, while none but a fanatic could ascribe that to the Spirit which, in religious exercises, is really attributable to a foreign cause. And as we said above, we regard the cause of the phenomenon in question as being ordinarily mixed, seldom or never pure; hence, only in so far as it is the result of Divine agency, can the effect involve a moral element. And inasmuch as the ordinary mode of the operation of the Spirit is to leave the subject of its influence in full possession of all his mental and physical faculties, we can make no certain reliance upon the moral character of such extraordinary cases. To be thrown into the cataleptic state in conversion, is no criterion of the genuineness of that change. The proof must be sought, and will be found, elsewhere. Religious catalepsy is not a safe standard by which to estimate a religious state, growth in grace, or personal piety in any stage of experience. Because, as we humbly conceive, the same amount of Divine influence shed upon the same person under one class of circumstances which would result in catalepsy, would, to another person in the same circumstances, and to the same person in other circumstances, be followed by no such result.

That falling into the cataleptic state is no standard by which to estimate piety, is clear from the fact that some persons of a nervous, impressible temperament, acquire the power to put themselves, almost at pleasure, into the religio-cataleptic state, and it becomes a habit with them to do so at their ordinary devotions. It is done by abstracting their minds from everything visible, tangible, sensible. Some might regard this as a proof of extraordinary piety; such persons may perhaps take large credit to themselves on this account; while it is resolvable into their peculiar temperament, together with their meditative and abstractive mental habit in their devotions; and perhaps to nothing else.

That our passive susceptibilities exert great sway over our active

* *Anxious Inquirer after Truth*, page 71.

mental powers, co-operating, if not coalescing with them, may be demonstrated by some familiar facts. Who does not know with what facility one may acquire the vicious habit of stammering, by accustoming himself to imitate one who has the misfortune to be a stuttrer. The sway of the passive susceptibilities over the active faculties at length becomes firm and relentless, like that of an inexorable tyrant, showing how much easier it is to form vicious habits than to supersede them by those which are good. And who has not proved upon himself with what exactness he can wake in the night at a given hour when he wishes, and has charged himself so to do? The philosophy of this coincidence is even more mysterious than the cataleptic state under inquiry. All the active powers, mental and physical, were in a state of repose. Hours had glided away. The given hour at length arrives, when, quick as thought, as if roused by the call of a vigilant and trustful sentinel—like a camp of soldiers at the first note of alarm, the hand of each grasping his arms and springing to his feet, all are prepared for the existing exigency—thus at the summons of the sleepless, passive susceptibilities of the soul, the active faculties, at the call of the former, instantly resume their respective functions. And it only requires due persistence in such a purpose, accompanied by the practice of rising at the time of waking, to establish the habit which secures the result for weeks and months together, and without the care and charge with which it was done at the outset. Custom forms the habit, and habit secures the result; and all by a process which is perfectly philosophical.

1. The first inference drawn from the above showing is, that there is danger of placing quite too much importance upon this occasional feature of personal piety and of revivals of religion. We cannot resist the conviction that the cataleptic exercise is the slenderest of all evidences of the genuineness and depth of the work of grace. It is not a criterion of piety. A revival may be genuine which is thus characterized. One may be equally so which is not marked by a solitary example of catalepsy; and precisely so as to individual Christians in every stage of experience. It must not be taken as the test or measure of piety. Other tests exist.

2. We are compelled to advance a step further. When we consider that the most reliable Christians for any post of trust or duty within the service of the Church, are not those who are distinguished for this peculiar trait of character, but for the depth, soundness, and permanence of their moral and intellectual qualities; when we note the fact, to which an exception has never come to our personal knowledge, that when the authorities of the Church are

in quest of a missionary or teacher for some foreign field, they uniformly pass over all this class of persons, and fix upon such as, with equal piety, are not distinguished for such habits; when we see how close is the relation between this cataleptic element in a church or community, leading to a consequent aspiring after it as the highest religious attainment, and the rankest religious fanaticism, we cannot repress the sentiment that leading members of the Church, and especially ministers, should not encourage it among the people. Let the latter, on the contrary, aim so to address themselves to the conscience, the understanding, the will, the rational and Scriptural hopes and fears of the masses, that with the promised aid of the Spirit, the character of the piety of the Church may be rather intelligent and deep, a matter of conviction and of principle, than of physical excitement, emotion, and mere feeling. A piety based upon the former, and distinguished by those features of character, has in it, after all, more of power as well as permanence. And for the best of all reasons, that it first forms and then distinguishes a class of mind expanded by culture and consolidated by conviction; and as "knowledge is power," this class must and will exert vastly more influence upon the world than that class ever did or can wield which is distinguished for the opposite qualities. A religion, not of impulse, not one which is fitful, narrow, or unstable in its character or tendency, but one which is elevating, expansive, reflecting, active, and permanent, at an equal remove from latitudinarianism and bigotry, is the want of the age. Such a religion, with all the appliances and agencies at her command, the Church is bound to supply. The world is waiting to receive the boon at her hand. Let us not be misunderstood. We do not countenance, much less advocate the doctrine that the Church should be limited to a sort of intellectual, educated, much less a monied aristocracy; or that religion should be a mere intellectual but frigid thing, without warmth, life, or sensibility. Nothing is further from our judgment, taste, or desire. On the contrary, let the intelligent, the enlightened, the fervent, the solid be duly combined. Let religion be a matter of conviction, of rule, of practice, of principle, as well as of feeling. And wherever it is of this type and spirit, unless we greatly misjudge, like a river whose source is exhaustless, whose channel is deep, whose volume is large, and whose current is steady and strong, unbroken by rapids or cataract, the tone of such piety will be of a much higher average as to emotion, ardency, and propellant stimulus to Christian activity, than when the whole picture is reversed. There may be less of the impulsive and fitful, but more of the substantial, reliable, efficient, and influential.

3. Nor can we find a solitary example of religious catalepsy recorded in the Old or New Testament. Not one in which at the same time there was a total suppression of the mental consciousness and muscular activity. Could one such instance be shown, it would present the question in a different aspect, and modify our own views at least respecting the philosophy of the whole matter. Could a solitary example be adduced from the patriarchs, prophets, Christ, or the apostles, an example evinced by a clear and judicious interpretation of such passage, we would yield to none in according to it the most deferential consideration. Such an example we believe cannot be produced; or if one such can be shown from the primitive Church, it would deserve serious attention. But if no such instance can be produced from Scripture history or the primitive Church, and this peculiar affection is only a feature incident to religious exercises in occasional times and places in the modern ages of the Church, then our convictions would be confirmed that it should be regarded as an accompaniment of the work of grace, to be viewed rather as a blemish than an ornament, and which, if encouraged, will prove a greater detriment than advantage to the cause of Christ and the honor of his kingdom.

4. In conclusion we beg leave to emphasize the remark, that we would neither sit in judgment upon, nor condemn any one for being a subject of the affection, the philosophy of which we have discussed. We make it no test of a sound conversion or of genuine personal piety. We are seldom in the least "tried" in witnessing such phenomena. We simply apply what we suppose to be the true principle of analysis, and resolve the whole matter upon the theory which we have imperfectly developed. We are aware how much allowance must be made for the diversity of temperament, taste, education, and mental habits and character, in religion. This should prompt us to exercise that large but discriminate charity which "hopeth all things." In fine, we sum up all with the prophet: "What is the chaff to the wheat?"

ART. V.—THE LIFE OF SIR JAMES MACKINTOSH.

Memoirs of the Life of the Right Honorable Sir James Mackintosh. Edited by his Son, ROBERT JAMES MACKINTOSH, Esq., Fellow of New College, Oxford. Two volumes, pp. 499, 524. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1854.

JAMES MACKINTOSH was born in Scotland, October 24, 1765. His native town was Aldourie, on the banks of the Loch Ness, county of Inverness. At the age of ten he was sent to school at a small town called Fortrose. Having much of his time at his own command, he was little disposed to regular habits of study. He was, however, a great reader, but read without method or regularity. Occasionally he made an attempt at writing poetry, at which he was not altogether unsuccessful. Before he was thirteen he avowed himself a Whig in politics, and talked with enthusiastic feelings on the exciting political topics of the day. These irregularities he much regretted in after life. He painfully felt that no subsequent effort could atone for "that invaluable habit of vigorous and methodical industry which the indulgence and irregularity of his school-life prevented him from acquiring." However, his school days were not entirely lost to him. The books he read belonged to the more substantial department of English literature. Some of them, being treatises upon abstruse metaphysical subjects, we suspect had much to do in directing his mind to those philosophical inquiries which afterward rendered him so eminent. He left Fortrose, having acquired the rudiments of an English education, and able very imperfectly to construe some portions of the classics.

In October, 1780, young Mackintosh entered King's College, Aberdeen. During his first winter here he read several elaborate works in addition to his regular studies. Among these were Priestley's *Institutes of Natural and Revealed Religion*, Beattie's *Essay on Truth*, and Warburton's *Divine Legation*; works certainly recondite and elaborate enough for a lad of fifteen. He refers to the latter when he says: "It delighted me more than any book I had yet read, and which, perhaps, tainted my mind with a fondness for the twilight of historical hypothesis, but which certainly inspired me with that passion for investigating the history of opinions which has influenced my reading through life."

At Aberdeen Mackintosh is described by one of his fellow-students as having been the center of all that was elegant and refined, by general acclaim, installed *inter studiosos facile princeps*. He

was familiarly designated "the poet," or "poet Mackintosh," and in connection with Robert Hall was the principal attraction of the literary club. It was at Aberdeen that Hall and Mackintosh first met. As their intimacy then had a controlling influence in directing their pathway to future eminence, it deserves special notice. Dr. Gregory, in his beautiful memoirs of Hall, has given us a graphic description of their peculiarities and mutual pursuits:

"Their tastes at the commencement of their intercourse were widely different, and upon most of the topics of inquiry there was no congeniality of sentiment; yet, notwithstanding this, the substratum of their minds seemed to be of the same cast, and upon this Sir James thought the edifice of their mutual regard first rested. . . . They read together, they sat together at lectures if possible, they walked together. In their joint studies they read much of Xenophon and Herodotus, and more of Plato, and so well was all this known, exciting admiration in some, in others envy, that it was not unusual, as they went along, for their school-fellows to point at them, and say, There go Plato and Herodotus. But the arena in which they most frequently met was that of morals and metaphysics. After having sharpened their weapons by reading, they often repaired to the spacious sands upon the seashore, and still more frequently to the picturesque scenery on the banks of the Don, above the old town, to discuss with eagerness the various subjects to which their attention had been directed. There was scarcely an important position in Berkeley's *Minute Philosopher*, in Butler's *Analogy*, or in Edwards on the Will, over which they had not debated with the utmost intensity. Night after night, nay month after month, for two sessions, they met only to study or dispute, yet no unkindly feeling ensued."

From these discussions Sir James declared that he learned more in regard to principles than from all the books he ever read. Hall, on the other hand, "reiterated his persuasion that his friend possessed an intellect more analogous to that of Bacon than any other person of modern times."

He passed through the regular course at King's College, and took his degree in the arts, 1784. The time had now come when he must choose a profession. He writes:

"My own inclination was toward the Scotch bar. But my father's fortune was thought too small for me to venture on so uncertain a pursuit. To a relation, from London, then in the Highlands, I expressed my wish to become a bookseller in the capital, conceiving that no paradise could surpass the life spent among books, and diversified by the society of men of genius. My cousin, 'a son of earth,' knew no difference between a bookseller and a tallow-chandler, except in the amount of annual profits. He astonished me by the information that a creditable bookseller, like any other considerable dealer, required a capital that I had no means of commanding, and that he seldom was at leisure to peruse any book but his ledger. Our deliberations terminated in the choice of physic, and I set out for Edinburgh to begin my studies in October, 1784." Vol. i, pp. 20, 21.

This choice, we may presume, was submitted to with no inconsiderable reluctance. The study and practice of medicine seemed to promise little congenial to his taste:

"To the natural sciences connected with the study of medicine, he had always shown indifference, if not dislike. The slow results of experiment, the minute investigations of nature, the deductions of the positive sciences, had no charm for him; mind and its operations, man and his thoughts, actions and interests, and the inquiries connected with them, were the objects of his unwearied and delighted study." Vol. i., p. 46.

Consequently one is not surprised to learn that he occasionally exhibited youthful impatience at the restraints of academic discipline, and that "his inclination for desultory reading and speculation" so greatly absorbed his mind, that he was familiarly called an "honorary member of the classes."

One thing, however, at Edinburgh, was entirely congenial to his taste, as it was certainly adapted to produce a thrilling effect on those powers which distinguished him so much at Aberdeen. We refer to the deep-toned literary feeling prevalent there. Edinburgh was crowded at this time with eminent men. Every department of literature and science had its representative. Men pre-eminent in knowledge, with minds polished and expanded by books and scholastic discipline, had diffused an elegance of manners, and given refinement to thought. A spirit of ambition was equally diffused among the students. In such society, amid competition and ardent aspirations for fame, a spirit of indolence was marked with infamy.

Having accomplished his medical course he quitted Edinburgh in the month of September, 1787, "with a store of knowledge more varied and comprehensive than methodically arranged, or concentrated on professional objects, but with aroused energies and youthful confidence in the future."

The next spring he visited London for the purpose of acquiring practice. He entered the metropolis little suspecting how easily he was to be allured from the ostensible object of his visit. Society in England, as well as on the continent, was already heaving with the coming storm of the French Revolution. Questions of liberty and reform were discussed wherever men met together, and the public mind was wrought up to the highest pitch of excitement. The profound and elegant works of Montesquieu, in connection with the productions of Rousseau and Voltaire, had prepared the way for this devoted period, while the revolt of the American colonies, and the financial bankruptcy of France, accelerated the movements of gathering clouds.

In addition to the generally exciting state of society, there was one special event calculated to arrest the attention of an ambitious youth. The trial of Warren Hastings had just begun. Day after day a dense throng crowded the seats and avenues of Westminster-Hall. Burke and Sheridan, at that time two master spirits of the

British bar, were putting forth their greatest efforts in the prosecution. The works of Burke Mackintosh had always admired. His sentiments of wisdom, arrayed in gorgeous language, had always stirred his youthful heart; and now that an opportunity offered, he crowded to the scene where he might feel the magic of the great man's voice.

These events, it may well be suspected, were little favorable to the quiet settlement and unobtrusive practice of the medical profession. Consequently, after several attempts to secure practice, he dismissed all thoughts of medicine, and "embarked on the more congenial current of politics."

The following paragraph gives us an idea of his peculiarities and mode of life at this time :

"Even at this early period he formed the delight of the societies which he frequented, not so much by the variety and extent of his knowledge, which even then was uncommon, as by his extraordinary flow of spirits, and lively but good-natured wit. He had always, even as a student, been distinguished by the amenity and politeness of his manners; and he was now compelled in London, as he had formerly been in Edinburgh, to pay the tax of these agreeable qualities. His company was sought after, and few were the occupations which induced him willingly to decline a pleasant invitation. He considered the mutual communication of agreeable information, and the interchange of social feelings, as not the least valuable object of human existence. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that his high spirits and vivid enjoyment of the company of his friends, deprived, as he now was, of any regular study or occupation, produced the natural consequences, and that for a season he gave himself up more to the jollity and thoughtless pleasures of his boon companions than the reflections of his quiet moments approved. . . . But if Mr. Mackintosh had not prudence sufficient to keep him from such haunts, his education, his character, his manners, the refinement of his mind, his habits of study and meditation, which never forsook him, his admiration of all that was elegant, generous, and noble, and his feelings of right, kept him always prepared for rousing himself from his trance, and asserting the natural elevation of his character." Vol. i, pp. 47, 48.

But the realities of life began now to press upon him. He had been in the metropolis a whole year without any professional pursuit. His time had been spent principally at the house of his maternal uncle, where he had been entertained as a guest. Without finances, without any regular source of income, and comparatively in the midst of strangers, what to do he knew not. In this state of uncertainty and poverty, the next step he took was not calculated to lessen his solicitude. He had become attached to a beautiful young girl, Miss Catherine Stuart, who visited occasionally at his uncle's, and their wedding festivities were privately celebrated in Mary-le-bone church, February 18, 1789. The relatives of both parties were of course justly offended. But this event, which at the time it were impossible to conceive would result otherwise than in

painful embarrassment, had almost a romantic sequel. From this time the whole stream of his destiny seemed to be changed.

"The new situation on which he had entered, formed, in his own thoughts, a marked era in his life, and called him to the exercise of new duties, of which his mind had always been too impartial, and his judgment too sound, not to estimate the true dignity. His feelings at every period of his life were essentially domestic, and even when most fond of company, he returned with pleasure to the simple enjoyments of the circle at home. He was easily amused. His good-nature made it painful to him to give uneasiness to any one near him. His love of study, the refinement of manners it cherishes, his turn for moral disquisition, and the high aspirations which never forsook him, his very love of good and polished society, were powerful auxiliaries to withdraw him from his failings. Happily Mrs. Mackintosh's dispositions were such as lent them the most efficient aid. She not only loved her husband, but was proud of his superior talents; with anxious solicitude and exemplary patience, she studied every means within her reach of recalling him to the habitual and methodical exercise of his abilities. She rendered home agreeable to him and his friends. She bore with his infirmities without murmuring, counseled him with tenderness, encouraged him to exertion. Her firm practical understanding speedily gained a useful influence over his kind and yielding nature—an influence which she never lost, and which, to the last, she attempted to employ for his benefit, and that of their children." Vol. i, p. 50.

He now applied himself assiduously to literary efforts. He studied incessantly, and wrote for various periodicals; and while he thus increased the range of his knowledge, he obtained a competency by the activity of his pen.

Meanwhile political events on the Continent were verging to a crisis. The French revolution was rapidly and terribly advancing. It had not only dethroned the king, and terrified and scattered all orders of the nobility, but its effect had crossed the Channel, and was painfully felt in every part of England. At this crisis Burke published his celebrated "*Reflections*." It was in reply to these that Mackintosh made his first attempt at elaborate authorship, in writing his "*Vindiciæ Gallicæ*." This "*Defense*," though composed in great haste, was discovered to be the work of a keen and powerful disputant. It was applauded everywhere, and was even quoted by Mr. Fox in the House of Commons. The chivalry it displayed in making an attack upon the very chief of political champions, with weapons, too, with which he was perfectly familiar, gave to the work a peculiar prestige. We cannot pause here to make extracts. It is enough to say that his remarks on the expediency of the revolution, the character of the National Assembly, the popular excesses which attended the abuse of freedom, and the new Constitution, were not only written in a style of classic elegance, but revealed a surprising grasp of political and historical knowledge.

It was some time previous to this he began to turn his attention to the profession of law. He had devoted himself with industry to

the preliminary studies required, and was admitted to the bar in November, 1795, by the Society of Lincoln's Inn, and attached himself to the home circuit. Aside from the usual curriculum of legal studies, his attention was early directed to the science of international law. This was a department to which his philosophical cast of mind more naturally inclined him. The study of natural law formed a part of the continental system of education, and also that of Scotland. But for the English student no such provision had been made. A sense of duty, therefore, as well as a predilection for this department, led him to form a plan for a course of lectures on the Law of Nature and Nations. He applied to the Benchers of Lincoln's Inn to grant him the use of their hall in which to deliver the lectures. They demurred, however, at first, on the ground that the author of "*Vindiciæ Gallicæ*" had uttered sentiments obnoxious to some portions of that body. To quiet the fears of his opponents, he published the introductory lecture, in which he gave a general outline of the whole course. The impression produced by this discourse, both in England and on the Continent, placed Mackintosh at once in the first rank of philosophical writers. Pitt, then prime minister, wrote him a private note, in which he said: "The plan you have marked out appears to me to promise more useful instruction and just reasoning on the principles of government, than I have ever met with in any treatise on the subject." And the following beautiful lines from Campbell, though doubtless the gushing tribute of personal friendship, will not be thought too highly colored by any who have read the tract referred to:

"If Mackintosh had published nothing else than this 'Discourse,' he would have left a perfect monument of his intellectual strength and symmetry, and even supposing that essay had been recovered only imperfect and mutilated, if but a score of its consecutive sentences could be shown, they would bear a testimony to his genius as decided as the bust of Thesus bears to Grecian art among the Elgin marbles."

The hall was finally granted, by the decisive interposition of Lord Chancellor Loughborough, and the whole course, consisting of thirty-nine lectures, was given to the public.

"The novelty of the undertaking, the acknowledged abilities of the author, and his early fame, acquired by the powerful support of opinions which it was known that the course of public events had induced him to modify, threw an interest over the execution of the design that daily filled the hall of Lincoln's Inn with an auditory such as never before was seen on any occasion." Vol. i., p. 107.

Soon after Mackintosh entered upon his legal pursuits he lost his fond and amiable wife. He felt this bereavement most keenly. She had been the cheerful companion of his poverty, and besides,

her gentle spirit, her counsels, and the constant encouragement she gave him in his literary and professional labors, contributed much to his prosperity and public reputation. While the affliction was still fresh a letter to his old and familiar friend, Dr. Samuel Parr, reveals the bitterness of his feelings, while it pays a just and beautiful tribute to her memory. It is an affecting memorial of domestic tenderness and sorrow. We regret we have space only for a single paragraph:

"I use the first moments of composure to return my thanks to you for having thought of me in my affliction. It was impossible for you to know the bitterness of that affliction, for I myself scarcely knew the greatness of my calamity till it had fallen upon me; nor did I know the acuteness of my own feelings till they had been subjected to this trial. Alas! it is only now that I feel the value of what I have lost. In this state of deep, but quiet melancholy which has succeeded to the first violent agitations of my sorrow, my greatest pleasure is to look back with gratitude and pious affection on the memory of my beloved wife, and my chief consolation is the soothing recollection of her virtues. Allow me in justice to her memory to tell you what she was, and what I owed her. I was guided in my choice only by the blind affection of my youth. I found her an intelligent companion and a tender friend, a prudent mistress, the most faithful of wives, and a mother as tender as children ever had the misfortune to lose. I met a woman who, by the tender management of my weaknesses, gradually corrected the most pernicious of them. During the most critical period of my life she preserved order in my affairs, from the care of which she released me. She gently reclaimed me from dissipation; she urged my indolence to all the exertions that have been useful or creditable to me, and she was perpetually at hand to admonish my heedlessness and improvidence. . . . Such was she whom I have lost, and I have lost her when her excellent natural sense was rapidly improving, after eight years of struggle and distress had bound us fast together, and molded our tempers to each other, when a knowledge of her worth had refined my youthful love into friendship, before age had deprived it of much of its original ardor; I lost her alas! (the choice of my youth, and the partner of my misfortunes) at a moment when I had the prospect of her sharing my better days." Pp. 95, 96.

Mackintosh had not been long at the bar before he was engaged in several important cases, in which he displayed great forensic ability. The most important was the trial of Peltier, a French emigrant royalist. This was an indictment for libel on Bonaparte, then first consul. The defense, as conducted by Mackintosh, though a splendid specimen of eloquence, was rather an eloquent and powerful defense, on general principles, of the liberty of the English press, than a direct argument for his client, based on the facts in the case and addressed to an impartial jury. He had *equity* undoubtedly upon his side, but the *law* was evidently against him, and Peltier was pronounced guilty. Lord Erskine was present during the trial, and before going to bed wrote the following note:

"DEAR MACKINTOSH,—I cannot shake off from my nerves the effect of your most powerful speech, which so completely disqualifies you for Trinidad or India. I could not help saying to myself as you were speaking, *O terram, illam, beatam, quæ hunc virum acceperit, hanc ingratham, si ejecerit, miseram, si amiserit.*" I perfectly approve of the verdict; but the manner in which you opposed it I shall always consider as one of the most splendid monuments of genius, learning, and eloquence. Yours ever,

MONDAY EVENING.

T. ERSKINE.

The intimation contained in this note refers to a project which had been, for some time, entertained by Mackintosh, of a professional settlement in either the East or West Indies. His hopes were gratified in the course of a few months in being selected, by government, to succeed Sir William Syer as recorder in the British province of Bombay. The appointment was made in 1803, and the honors of knighthood were conferred on him about the same time.

Having been now for the second time married, (April 10, 1798,) he started, in connection with his family, for his distant home, early in 1804:

"His first care, next to his tender and assiduous attention to Lady Mackintosh, who suffered from illness during a part of the passage, was directed to the instruction of his children. He allowed no duty to interfere with this. Besides the more varied instructions which their mother took a pleasure in affording, he regularly read with them some book of English literature, particularly the poetical works of Milton, and the papers of the Spectator written by Addison. He never intermitted his own readings, which were directed to most subjects of human curiosity, except the mathematical and natural sciences. He had on board his excellent library, and he employed many hours daily in running over, or studying the works he had recently added to it; but always intermingling some classical writers of ancient or modern times, a practice from which in no circumstances did he ever deviate. In the course of the voyage he availed himself of the leisure which he possessed, and of the assistance of his daughters' governess, a young German lady, to study the German tongue, some acquaintance with which he had gained several years before. By vigorous application he now became a proficient, not only in the poetical, but in the philosophical idiom of that opulent language, a circumstance of the greatest service to him in pursuing his subsequent metaphysical inquiries into the history of German philosophy. He also paid more attention to Italian literature than he ever before had leisure to do, a natural consequence of which was, that it rose considerably in his estimation." Vol. i, pp. 203, 204.

They arrived at Bombay the 26th of May, and on the 28th the new recorder took his oath of office, and entered at once on his duties. His residence in the East is the least fruitful of incident of any part of his life. It is impossible to read his Memoirs without a feeling of regret that he ever went there. Separated from his friends, and at a distance of fifteen thousand miles from his native land, the thread of his political connections snapped asunder, with no generous and intelligent public to stimulate him to prosecute and

complete the noble literary and philosophical projects he had conceived amid the excitements of London, he pined in secret over a destiny he had voluntarily chosen. He felt that the allurements of a future pension and the largeness of his salary were at best but meager compensation for the sacrifices he had made. "Had he remained at the bar he might have surpassed Erskine in learning, and rivaled him in skill as an advocate, while his depth and amplitude of thought would have furnished the richest materials for every occasion that admitted of eloquence. He needed, beyond most men, to be kept steadily at work under the impulse of great objects and strong motives urging him to the utmost exertion of his powers."* We notice some things, however, quite characteristic. The formation there of a literary society, his letters home, his philosophical studies, his love of virtue amid society where depravity was not restrained by public sentiment, his generous pity for the ignorant and vicious, and his integrity as a judge, are all worthy of imperishable record.

The literary society he was instrumental in forming was organized the 26th of November, 1805. He was appointed its first president, and was the nucleus of all its interests. At the first meeting he opened the proceedings by an address, in which he stated its literary and scientific objects. The eulogy he pronounced at that time on Sir William Jones might perhaps be taken, by a partial friend, as almost a literal transcript of himself. In language of great sweetness and beauty he mingles that peculiar reverence for genius and virtue for which he was always distinguished.

His residence in India was, on the whole, injurious to his intellectual growth. He read a great deal, gathered vast materials for the great works in history and ethics which he had projected, wrote occasional articles for the periodicals of the island, and indulged in copious correspondence with friends at home; but his old habits of desultory reading and ingenious speculation allured him from the grand objects of his life, so that during the whole period of his residence in Bombay he consummated but little aside from his professional avocations. He returned to England in 1812, with his material interests but little improved, and with his constitution painfully impaired by an Eastern climate.

The two public independent bodies of Bombay, the "Grand Jury" and the "Literary Society," both presented him testimonials of their regard before his departure. The latter elected him its honorary president, and requested him to sit for his bust to be placed in their library; on which occasion Sir John Malcolm observed:

* *Select British Eloquence*, p. 825.

"In offering some remarks upon that good which I believe to have resulted to Oriental literature from his example and influence, I shall speak with all the confidence that personal observation and experience can inspire. From the hour that Sir James Mackintosh landed in this country, he commenced, with an ardor that belongs only to minds like his, to make himself master of the history, the usages, and the religion of the inhabitants; and his progress was such as was to be expected from his capacity. As he had never made the Oriental languages his study in Europe, the period of his residence and the nature of his occupations while here, forbade his wasting time more valuably employed, in a course of study which he could not have completed. He, indeed, took a larger and better view of the good he had it in his power to effect; and those moments which would have been unprofitably given, by a man of his rich and cultivated mind, to the elements of an Indian language, were employed in kindling into flame those sparks of emulation and knowledge which his penetration discovered in men already possessed of that useful but subordinate qualification. It is impossible to estimate the exact quantity of good which his efforts produced; but it certainly very far exceeded what the individual labor of any one man could have effected. His character is, indeed, admirably calculated to forward that object which is constantly nearest his heart, 'the general diffusion of knowledge.' He showed, during his stay in India, a toleration and indulgence that extended even to the ignorant, where they showed a desire of improvement, and to all those whom he deemed capable of being actively useful in the advancement of learning and science, he afforded the most flattering and substantial encouragement. His advice, his time, were at their service, and they found him, at all moments, disposed to give them his aid toward the promotion of their individual interests and fame." Vol. ii., p. 115.

Such was the esteem placed on his talents, that immediately after his return home, he was offered a seat in Parliament, both by the government, and also by his old friends the Whigs. He chose the latter, and continued in the House of Commons till his death, closely adhering to his decision through all the vicissitudes of political life. He was not, however, by any means merely a party man. His political sentiments were always controlled by his moral convictions. His principles were liberal, and his political efforts were free from strife, intrigue, and malice. With acknowledged integrity and talents, and with a fidelity to his political connections which the most splendid allurements from an opposite direction could not shake, he enjoyed, nevertheless, but limited promotion. During the administration of Canning he was appointed Privy Councillor, and subsequently, a commissioner for the affairs of India. It was not, however, because he was averse to enviable distinction; for he never indulged in the trick of disclaiming talents he knew he possessed. Still "he never made the slightest efforts to advance his interests with his political friends; never mentioned his sacrifices nor his services, expressed no resentment at neglect, and was therefore pushed into such situations as fall to the lot of the feeble and delicate in a crowd." Vol. ii., p. 504.

His political efforts were confined principally to the House of
FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XI.—16

Commons. But this was not the theater for the most happy display of his talents. He never attained there the celebrity which he won for himself by his forensic efforts before his appointment to the East. The lapse of only a few years had brought on him the infirmities of age. He had lost the vigor and ambition of youth, so that the stormy eloquence and rough debate that would crowd the galleries and lobbies of the House at midnight, did not suit either his taste, or his capacity. He always displayed profound knowledge of the topics he discussed; but he was too minute, dwelt too much on details, for popular effect; and his habits of speculation, added to his range of scholarship, were an evident incumbrance to rapid, off-hand debate.

In his political career he was the intimate associate of Romilly, Brougham, Earl Grey, Canning, Francis Horner, and Wilberforce. With these men, whose names are imperishable in the annals of British legislation, he took an active part in all the great struggles for Parliamentary reform.

In 1818 he was appointed Professor of Law and General Politics in the College at Hailesbury. This college was instituted for the education of young men designed for the East India service. The long residence of Sir James in the East, combined with his extraordinary attainments and public reputation, eminently qualified him for this post. And besides, it was entirely congenial to his tastes. His love of letters, and the amenities of literary life, were ever to him matters of paramount importance. The subject of morals, too, which entered largely into the course of instruction prescribed, had been the object of his earliest and most ardent study. Still, with all these attractions, his mind was not undivided in its pursuits. His profound interest in politics, his connection with the House of Commons, and consequently with public men, and his wonderful powers and facility in colloquial discussion, allured him too frequently from the labors of the desk.

His literary productions subsequent to his appointment to Hailesbury, were mostly fragmentary. His "Early History of England" and his "History of the Revolution of 1688," though not without obvious faults, are, nevertheless, elegant pieces of historical composition. His "Sketch of the Progress of Ethical Philosophy" is a masterpiece of its kind. His contributions to the *Edinburgh Review*, and indeed the most transient productions of his pen, were valuable, for he never wrote upon trivial topics; and whether we follow him in politics, history, or ethics, we discover everywhere gleams of light that flash across our path.

In 1832, at a time when applying himself with unwonted indus-

try to literary pursuits, the life of Sir James was suddenly terminated by an accident which produced inflammation of the throat. He died 30th of May, in the sixty-seventh year of his age; "perhaps more regretted and less envied than any public man of his age."

The world, in pronouncing judgment on the literary merits of Mackintosh, will have more regard to his attainments as a scholar, than what he accomplished as an author. His largest, and what he contemplated as his grandest work, his "History of England," was posthumous, and consequently unfinished. His life, he confessed, had been scattered over too large a surface. As a student, in the acquisition of knowledge, he was ardent and unwearied. But in productiveness many of his efforts failed to come up to the expectations of his friends. His great attainments and genius stood recorded in the public mind as a kind of mortgage, pledged as security for the accomplishment of magnificent literary works, and works, too, which every one knew he was adequate to perform. But he lacked steady and persevering application. He was deeply sensible of this, and there were not infrequent struggles between his better judgment and the proclivities of an easy disposition. "My works," he writes on one occasion, "are still but projects." And at another time, feeling how his heart had been divided between the rival and jealous claims of politics and literature, at the same time his early and unredeemed vows in regard to authorship being revived by recent reflection, he exclaims, with Madame de Sevigné, "*Ma vie est pleine de repentie*"—"My life is full of repentance."

Aside, however, from everything else, we have felt the deepest interest in these "Memoirs" of Sir James, as the record of an accomplished and elegant scholar. To become pre-eminent as a man of letters was, indeed, the object of his earliest ambition. It floated before his mind continually. It affected his imagination as with the power of magic, alluring him to patient study, and promising him the rewards of fame. Literature and philosophy seemed to be his appropriate province. His classical taste, his sweetness of disposition, his polished and graceful manners, his ardent love of truth and virtue, and the unaffected modesty which mingled with the most profound and varied attainments, gave him at once an easy passport to the most refined and learned circles of his day.

ART. VI.—HAVEN'S MENTAL PHILOSOPHY.

Mental Philosophy, including the Intellect, Sensibilities, and Will. By Professor JOSEPH HAVEN. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1858.

THIS volume occupies the whole ground claimed by psychology. It discusses the *intellect*, the *sensibilities*, and the *will*. The method which is adopted in the first and second branches is far more thorough than that which obtains in the third. The completeness of the work distinguishes it from all those essays which restrict themselves to a single department of the mind. The plurality of the mind in its faculties, and its unity as a whole, are maintained by a sifting analysis and by a comprehensive synthesis. It is not the least interesting feature in this writer to find each topic in his volume succinctly accompanied with its appropriate literature, especially as he has abstained from blending the literary and the critical, which never fails to be confusion instead of illustration.

Mr. Haven has grouped together many of the profound thoughts of modern mind, without allowing them to take the place of his own. He introduces the reader to such thinkers as Kant and Sir William Hamilton, but never exhibits the servility of a mere copyist. He has displayed no less independence of these borrowed treasures than skill in appropriating them. Nor is this volume wanting in the characteristics claimed by a scientific style. The poetic element which adorns it is neither large nor wanting; it tinges the sterner features of expression without dazzling the eye that examines those features; that perspicuity and precision with which the science of mind can never afford to part, candor compels us to award to Mr. Haven. Though we cannot accord to him that vigor and compression of thought which some of his reviewers have eulogized in his book, we deem him at least respectable in these higher tests of merit. Still further are we from awarding to him that originality which entitles a writer to the honor of a discoverer. There is here none of that bewitching radiance with which genius bathes its new-born offspring. He ranks with that large class of writers whose mission is rather to select and classify truth, long the property of cultivated intellect, than to enlarge the boundaries of knowledge by new applications of great principles.

We are far from admitting the dogma that mental science is not susceptible of important advances; that it cannot be enriched by undiscovered truths which remain to be found within the compass of human thought. All important improvements in this branch are

modern. They scarcely have the antiquity of a century, and who shall now determine its present limit to be immovable?

Especially is it susceptible of enrichment from the rapid developments of physiology, that kindred science.*

But to portray the excellences or defects of our author on the intellect and sensibilities would be a departure from the aim of

* That physiology sustains no unimportant relation to the doctrine of the mind is now an adjudicated question. Though the extent to which its mysteries may be unraveled by a profounder insight into the organs on which it operates, may be mere conjecture, the fact of psychological advancement by physiology is indisputable.

Till recently the whole nervous texture was supposed to execute but one nervous office. To convey impressions from the outward organs to the brain and back again to those organs was deemed the only use of the nerves. They now are known to form five distinct systems, each having its own center and executing its own office, each restricted by and independent of the others. But this particular independence allows of a general affiliation, securing entire harmony of action and unity of result.

The office of each tubulated fiber is that of a conductor. It conveys impressions from the external organs to the brain, and from this back to those organs. The first nervous system usually described is the *sympathetic*. These nerves preside over the organs which have no connection with either the brain or spinal marrow except by a few springs and branches. 2. The *excito-motory* nerves have their origin in a series of ganglea occupying the axis of the spinal marrow, connecting the sensory and voluntary nerves with the brain. These provide for the action of a large class of muscles; never consulting the will, or ceasing to operate in the deepest sleep, through the influence of these nerves the dying agonies take place often without consciousness, and perhaps after the soul's flight. 3. The *sensu-motory* system originates in the ganglea lying at the base of the brain between the cerebrum and the spinal marrow. The relation of these nerves to the spirit is sufficiently direct to originate all sensations. Not volitions, but sensations are the proper stimulus to these nerves. Exciting to winking, sneezing, coughing, and the like, are among their functions. 4. In passing to the cerebral system we find it situated entirely within the cranial cavity. 5. Below this is seated the *cerebellum*. Its important connections are with the cerebrum, the ganglea at the base of the brain, and with the spinal marrow. Its chief function is the regulation of muscular action. It was removed from a bird without arresting its vital functions. Sensation, perception, and voluntary motion remained unimpaired. But it could execute with precision no action requiring the combined exercise of several muscles. It could eat food when placed in its mouth, but was utterly unable to procure it. Remove the cerebrum and a very different result ensues; perception and volition are no more. This being the seat of these, it supplies materials to the intellect. From this single glance at this organic dependence of the several classes of mental phenomena, the relations of these organs to the complex operations of the mind will be readily perceived. It will also be perceived that the complex states of mind and the intuitions of reason lie far out of the organic sphere. They are within the confines of the spirit. Take recollection for an illustrative example. This consists of *reproduction* and *recognition*. These two elements lie in very

this paper. We took up our pen solely to review him on the will.

This third and briefest portion of the book, less than either of the other parts, bears the impress of originality. Still the intrinsic merits of the subject must be deemed paramount. This branch of psychology is far from being modern or merely speculative. It was among the earliest problems which elicited the discussions of mankind. If it were not agitated in ancient India before Grecian mind awoke, it occupied this mind in the infancy of its philosophic struggles. Those two great schools of the nation, the Stoic and Epicurean, were apparently on opposite sides of this question. Not less ancient was the conflict on this ground between those schools in the chosen nation, composed of the Pharisees and Sadducees and Essenes. The attempt at solving this problem occupied no inconsiderable space in the Arabian philosophy. This philosophy, being the offspring of their theology, discussed with intense interest this central idea.

In the seventh century, when the Koran had birth, it took sides with the fatalists and maintained itself against the Karites, that

different spheres. Recognition is an operation of the spirit, entirely independent of the organs, only as they evoke the ideas to which it relates. The reproduction or conception is awakened by the cerebrum; it is not organic, though awakened by that organ. The judgment passed on that conception is done entirely by the mind. The conclusion is therefore fully authorized, that were the brain destroyed the mind would be adequate to such judgments, provided any other medium, or organ, or agent preceded them. What is true of this element of recollection is equally so of the entire class of interior perceptions which are referable to the intuitions of reason. The phenomena are of another class, being occasioned by the immediate relation of the organs to the mind. Though they could not exist without something above sensation, they are without those lofty characteristics which distinguish the mind's own immediate operations. Physiology, then, refutes the confident assertions of phrenology. This affirms that the intellections and moral sentiments arise from certain parts of the cerebrum as the immediate instruments of their manifestation. This is positively negated by the known structure and functions of the brain; nor can sensationalism survive the stern conclusions of mental science guided by the sure light of physiology. This points out the fixed limit of sensation, and leaves all beyond for intellection. The late powerful advocates of the sensational philosophy have compared the unlikeness of sensation to intellection. How, then, have they denuded the mind of all but sensation? Simply by affirming that intellection is *transformed* sensation. But what transforms it? Such an advocate finds nothing in the whole universe but itself to transform it. And this is a virtual abandonment of that degrading hypothesis. It seems to us impossible that these debasing conceptions of mind should keep their ground when physiology shall be honored with its merited culture.

The aim of this note is not, of course, to settle any of these great questions, but to call out far abler pens to discuss them.

powerful party of Mohammedans, for more than three hundred years. Still earlier did this controversy agitate the Christian Church. The fourth century had scarcely closed when the Manicheism of Augustine's youth led him to readopt this feature of it in his controversy with Pelagius. Though this new dogma almost slumbered in the Church for ages, it was afterward discussed by six councils. In the ninth century, through the agency of the Saxon monk, Godeschalens, the flame of controversy on it was rekindled. The few mighty minds which shone as scattered but intense lights of the mediæval age, were in almost equal numbers on opposite sides of the freedom of the will. The great monastic fraternities which arose in the Latin Church before the revival of letters were on opposite sides in this controversy. On no question was the conflict fiercer than on this between the Dominicans and the Augustinians and the Jesuits and other orders whose origin belongs to later ages.

We could not, without diversion from our object, even allude to the forces which conspired to imbue so many of the Reformers with the dogma of Augustine.

Of these, however, the student of history needs not to be informed. The array is formidable of modern philosophers who have vindicated opposing views on the doctrine of the will. Hobbes, Leibnitz, Collins, Edwards, Priestley, Belsham, Kames, Hartley, Mill, M'Cosh, and Lewis, are among the leading defenders of necessitated volition.

Our author is found in the same category. Though he often apparently identifies himself with the advocates of *free will*, yet when he finally takes his position he is found standing erect among necessitarians. The fact that in clear and strong language he vindicates *free will* is by no means peculiar to him; it appertains to his class. We scarcely meet with an atheistic fatalist who has not unequivocally vindicated the freedom of the will.

This is not the place to exhibit their mode of harmonizing these opposites. We will only state here, that one portion of them believe the opposites both true; the other use the term *freedom* so as not to conflict with *necessity*.

Professor Haven has so fully stated his position on pp. 562, 563, as to leave no one at a loss on which side he is found. The following is substantially his statement, if we have not failed to grasp his meaning:

"Providence has a plan of operations; this plan sweeps over the entire train of events, including the great and the minute, the benignant and the malign, such as distinguish nations and combine ages. That not an act in the great drama of human probation

transpires out of this plan, as it includes the thoughts, feelings, and purposes of all earth's actors. These are, therefore, all under God's entire control, and at the same time are the free acts of human agents. But how is this entire control divinely exercised over human volitions consistent with the freedom of those volitions?"

"This freedom and this control are both facts, and therefore both true."

"Taken together they appear inconsistent, and have often been pronounced so. The fatalist secures the supreme government of God at the expense of human freedom. The libertarian, horrified by fatalism, preserves man's freedom at the expense of God's government."

In accordance with this statement the professor finally furnishes this definition of freedom: "It lies in the power of forming and putting forth such volitions as we please; . . . so that whatever our volitions may be, we shall be at liberty to choose and will accordingly." "This," he adds, "is the highest freedom that appertains to the human will." We have thus, without employing all the author's words, conveyed unimpaired his ideas. These, in a compressed form, make this proposition: *God controls* all man's volitions, and *man controls* all his own volitions.

Now the advocate of this proposition must either maintain that its two parts are *not in conflict*, or that *opposite propositions* may both be true.

The propositions that all my volitions are under the entire control of each, my Maker and of myself, are *really* or only *apparently* in conflict. Let us then for the moment exclude all other objects, that the solution of this assertion may entirely command our attention. The question is suggestive: Can any event be the product of two efficient causes? It will be conceded that one efficient cause is adequate to its legitimate effect. The second then might be dispensed with; but as the effect bears the same relation to both, either of them, and therefore both, might be dispensed with. But then the event would be without a cause, which is absurd. Therefore it cannot be entirely produced by each of two causes. Again: Does not the very causal relation to an event shut out all other causal relation to it? If not, then it is both a cause and not a cause of the same event. Its causal relation then must preclude the possibility of anything else sustaining such a relation to the event. A volition cannot, therefore, have its cause both in me and in my Maker. If in him, it is not in part or in whole in me. If in me, he has no causal hand in it. Our author may select for his adoption, but he cannot be allowed to refer any volition to *two* producing causes; nor can he be permitted to make me the *occasional* cause,

and God the *efficient* cause, or the reverse, and then affirm that each controls my volitions. As only an *efficient* cause can control an event, to no conditions under which that cause may operate can that control be transferred. Is it alleged that "God produces my volitions by motives, and my assent to them leaves my responsibility unimpaired?" But if of this assent he is equally the author, how can it sustain responsibility? What is volition but the mind acting? Does not its very nature, then, no less than the nature of *cause*, locate its authorship in me and not on the throne of the universe? If I am its author, it is my mind acting; if God be its author, it is my mind being *acted upon*, and the volition belongs to God the actor. To ascribe its cause to both is a contradiction. Nor can this conflict of ideas be mitigated by alleging we should never reject one of two propositions because the tie of their harmony lies too deep for our perception. This we instantly concede, but what has the concealed harmony of ideas to do with the perceived conflict between them?

To substitute that obscurity arising from the depth of connected truths, for that contradiction which glares on conflicting truths, is a most imposing fallacy. Our difficulty in this case is not in failing to see how the two parts of the proposition can be true, but in perceiving in the light of vision that it is impossible for them to be true.

Thus has many a palpable contradiction been accepted as a mere obscurity. We must remind such reasoners that the ground of these are directly opposite. When the relations of truth lie buried in the shades of mystery, accumulating evidence assuages that darkness, so that assurance arises that sufficient light will vanquish all obscurity and disclose the harmony. But when propositions are in conflict every added beam of evidence discovers intenser antagonism. That the system of God's administration involves unpierced mysteries one can scarcely doubt without insanity; but that it involves contradictions, that whole classes of truth are at open war, none but the Manichean should affirm. Who can maintain this conflict in God's government without involving a corresponding hostility in his perfections? To divest him of moral character, to "set at odds heaven's jarring attributes, and with one excellence to wound the rest," is inevitable.

Allege the facts that God *controls* our volitions, and that we *control them so as to be free*, and what principle but that of discord in Jehovah have you adopted? If two opposing truths may rest on evidences mutually destructive of each other, why may not a thousand truths be in equally hostile array? Why may not all the

truth in the universe be, in like manner, divided in equal parts, so that these equal and opposing evidences would neutralize each other, leaving all truth void of any evidence? Then, whatever would *prove* the truth of each, would *destroy* the evidence of both; as whatever would be the neutralization of the one, would be the annulment of the other. Thus would all general principles be vitiated by utter invalidity.

But the advocates for motive-control are far from being self-consistent. Their incessant vacillations are indicative of the difficulty of their position. It would be facile to verify this charge by copious extracts from scores of that school. This our limits forbid, and restrict us to brief quotations from a few of them, as specimens of their fraternity. For this purpose let us collocate a few passages from M'Cosh on the Divine Government. This highly popular writer states that "it is with all philosophers, who have deeply studied the subject, a fundamental principle of our mental constitution, which leads us, upon the occurrence of any given event, to say it has a cause."

He proceeds to apply this principle to the thoughts, feelings, wishes, and volitions of the human mind: (p. 281 :) "We see numerous proofs," he alleges, "of this law of cause and effect reigning in the human mind as it does in the external world, and reigning in the *will* as it does in every other department of the mind." (p. 236, 237.)

Could utterances be stronger, assuring us that the same law constituting the changeless mechanism of nature reigns in the human will, *producing* all its *volitions*? Now we appeal to those familiar with Crombie, Kames, Collins, Hobbes, or Spinoza, or with any other leader in the school of fatalists, whether more absolute necessity is by any of these imposed on our volitions than by this Christian divine. Is any of these atheists a sterner defender of this iron scheme of fatalism?

Now what could more surprise us than to find this same writer among the most staunch libertarians; such, however, is unequivocally his position. Hear his own words: "We rejoice to recognize such a being in man. We trust we are cherishing no presumptuous feeling, when we believe him to be as *free as his Maker is free*." "We believe him, morally speaking, as independent of external control as his Creator must ever be—as that Creator was, when, in a past eternity, there was no external existence to control."

What advocate of freedom, glowing in the intensest fervors, ever uttered mightier words than these? All the Clarkes, and Reids, and Coleridges, who have led the van of the advocates of free-will, may

be challenged in vain for terms of loftier expression. What, then, is that concealed *nexus* which binds in harmony these apparently warring positions? Professor Haven affirms, "both these to be facts, and therefore both true. M'Cosh says: "Should it be demanded of us to reconcile them, we answer we are not bound to offer positive reconciliation of them." We point to the two objects; but we are not bound to show what is the link which connects them." This we believe to be in harmony with the position of all Christian necessitarians. But is not this a startling position which teaches "that the will is self-active, and yet that all its acts are produced by causes operating out of itself; and that the advocate of these repugnancies is not bound to harmonize them? How, without some unexpected light, can we believe that the will is under the same law which governs mechanical nature, and yet is as free as the unmoved mover of the heavens and the earth, above and beyond whose Almighty power there is and can be no controlling cause?" When we ask with emphasis, are those conflicting propositions consistent with the harmony which the Architect of the universe has taught to expect in every part of his administration, is the answer, "both are true," sufficient?

When we are compelled by the laws of thought to pronounce the two parts of the proposition utterly alien, in fierce and mortal conflict, involving the most irreconcilable conclusions, is it enough to allege that each depends on independent evidence, and therefore lies out of the range of mutual repugnancy? Such shifts can never harmonize the opposing elements which bristle in this fierce antagonism.

Its advocate asks, "Must the connection be pointed out which unites two truths, established on independent evidence, before the mind gives its assent to them? Must the connection be pointed out between mechanical and chemical combinations, before we believe in their existence?" "We require only the separate evidence of the existence of each." (p. 280.) Does he imagine the illustration to be apposite? Were there a palpable contradiction in the combination of the mechanical and chemical truths, the illustration would be fit, and then the two could not be received on the opposing evidence of each, but only in the light of the harmonizing tie. Now this is precisely what we demand for our faith in the two parts of the conflicting propositions before us. But while the idea of necessity is at open war with the idea of liberty, one must disprove the other until their opposition is proved unreal.

But the mode by which Professor Haven renders these opposites

credible, is the common expedient of his school. Let M'Cosh again speak for the fraternity. He says: "It is absurd to suppose the one doctrine *sets aside the other*." In this position there is no want of harmony among the scores we might quote. But we must be allowed to ask, *why* it is "not absurd" to suppose liberty does not set aside necessity, or that necessity does not set aside liberty? If both be true, the advocate for them finds nothing to refute in the libertarian. All the latter vindicates is conceded by him. But on what ground is the will's absolute control by motives deemed consistent with the will's freedom? Is the answer, on the ground that both are proved? But is not the proof found in their opposition equal to that which sustains either, so that their very opposition neutralizes their evidence? What can more triumphantly refute a proposition, than to show it in open conflict with acknowledged principle? We here detect such conflict. For when the theory affirms that every volition is an effect of which the prevailing motive is the cause, is it not at open war with the principle which ascribes the volition to another cause? How can the sole cause of volition be *in* the mind and *out* of it; be both in the soul and in the motives out of the soul? How can volition be both a cause and an effect? both active and passive? both the producer and the produced?

Is it alleged that the created agent is both? Certainly he is not. A created mind is an *effect* in one sphere, but an agent in another sphere. The cause which *made* the future agent an *effect*, is not what *makes him a cause*. His cause ceases to operate before he, as a cause, commences operating; that which produced him, and that which he produces, have two causes. So that, where his agency commences, God's ceases, and his caused character had no existence till after his character as an effect was finished. This leaves whatever is essential to a cause absolutely wanting in an effect, and whatever is essential to an effect, at an unapproachable distance from a cause. The agent's power was an effect, but its exercise is ineffably unlike an effect. Power is not a cause until it operates. Its operation is the agent's, not his author's. Its simple existence, as an effect, cannot modify its character as a cause. No antecedents of a causal exertion can transfer themselves to that exertion. The difference, therefore, between man as an effect, and man as a cause, is no less than between man and a rock of granite.

As an effect, the cause lay entirely out of himself; as an agent, the cause lay entirely within himself. In the one case the cause must operate when he was not, in the other he must operate in becoming a cause. No matter when or where a created agent was

brought on the stage, the separating distance remains immeasurable between him as an *effect*, and him as a cause. They can no more exchange places than mind and matter—than something and nothing.

The *passive* and *active* can therefore never be each the cause of volition. Nor can the passive be the cause of anything. This brings us again to the conclusion, that placing the cause of volition out of the mind, is to destroy the possibility of volition originating in the mind.

We cannot forbear urgently demanding of these theorists, why they allow the principle they adopt but a partial application?

But we must hasten to consider that ground of necessitated volition found in the FOREKNOWLEDGE of God. What, then, is the relation which that knowledge sustains to man's actions? The fact that God's knowledge grasps *all* events, as its contents, we never doubted. Nor could we ever perceive the shadow of a demand for the withholding of that knowledge from events, that they might be contingent.

Such a demand supposes that God's knowledge of an occurrence either makes it unavoidable, or finds it so. The elaborate arguments employed to prove the absence of all that is *causal* in God's knowledge, we regard as a mere waste of words. We suppose that the felt difficulty in the Divine prescience lies not in what it *caused*, but in the *necessity* in the events which its *certainty* supposed. It was this *logical* necessity, involved in God's foreknowledge, which authorised Luther to pronounce it "a thunderbolt to dash free-will to atoms." We are not a little amazed to find such thinkers as Locke, Stewart, and Campbell expressing their utter incapacity to reconcile God's prescience with man's freedom! Now we earnestly demand what there is in these two things beyond the harmonizing power of evidence? Where do the ideas clash which are essential to the two? If the ideas appear in conflict, is it certain that they correspond respectively to this knowledge and that freedom? If we find the Divine knowledge related precisely in the same manner to what has occurred and to what is taking place, as to what shall in future transpire, then, if it neither causes necessity, or finds it, in all these classes of events, it does in none of them. That in past events it finds no causal necessity is plain, as their cause has ceased to operate. It, therefore does not in future events.

If God's knowledge of any events either make them necessary, or presuppose them necessary, it must bear the same relation to *all* events; it must comprehend all the acts of God, and all those of men; all achieved in time and in eternity; all the terrific rebellion of men

and demons; all the sublime devotions of heavenly natures; all these agents, with the *Infinite One* in the same category, God's knowledge loads with the everlasting fetters of necessity. If God's knowledge of his own acts supposes a necessity of his performing them, that necessity must be out of him, and thereby render it impossible that *He* should be the Supreme.

There is an axiomatical necessity of the existence of an event, in order that it may be known; that is, it cannot be out of being and in being at the same time. The Divine knowledge corresponds with its contents. This necessity, then, simply amounts to a certainty, but essentially differs from *causal* necessity. It cannot be uncertain whether what is, is. But this axiom has nothing to do with the necessity of the event coming into being. The invincible obstacle therefore to man's freedom, arising out of God's foreknowledge, is found in substituting causal necessity for absolute certainty.

If volitions be the effect of which motives are the cause, then is the *dominion of necessity* UNIVERSAL.

The steps are few and direct to this fearful conclusion. The volition cannot be produced by the motive without being preceded by it. The volition then lying entirely out of the sphere, its cause can exert on the motive no influence. The volition does not even come into existence till its producing motive has finished its operation. Thus it is impossible for the mind, which can only act by volition, to avoid its volitions. Indeed, no effect can modify its cause unless it acts before it exists. But if volition cannot influence its motive, it certainly cannot be the antecedent to its motive. Trace retrospectively the entire series, and you only increase the distance between the volition and its antecedent. The necessity, therefore, of the volition is not diminished by multiplying the second causes lying between it and the first cause. It is certain, therefore, that there can be no room for freedom between the volition and the first cause. But may there not be between the volition and its *effect*? If there be none here there can be none in the universe. Now we affirm that no certainty is more indubitable than that there is none here. How can there be? Both the volition and its sequence, by the theory, are *effects*. How then can the volition bear a causal relation to its sequence any more than this sequence can to what follows it? The volition being strictly an *effect*, how can it be causal of its sequence more than any other *effect* can act as a cause? If volition be *necessary*, all that precedes it up to the first cause must be so, and for equal reasons its sequences must be so. Is it then possible to assign volition any place but a link in the necessary chain of sequences?

But what makes this alleged fact a thousand times more startling

is that it involves UNIVERSAL MIND, that it binds the Supreme intellect in the same fetters of necessity. Necessity cannot attend one step in the series and be separated from any other step. The theory maintains that volition, from its *very nature*, without a motive cause, would be an absurdity. If then the demand arises out of the *nature* of volition, it must apply to mind without distinction, to God's as to man's. There can be no exemption for the Infinite mind! Whatever other differences exist between the created mind and the Infinite mind, there is none here.

God's volitions being the source of ours the theory compels us to reason of them as we do of our own. We have then reached that mysterious point where the motive and the efficient cause are identical. But the sequel will show us that this sameness of the two is the *exclusion* of one. Whatever locates causal power in mere motive divests all mind of such energy.

This awful question arises then, involving an affirmative answer, are not the worst deeds in the universe as *guiltless* as they are *necessitated*? The conviction sways all minds, by their very structure, that the guilt of an evil deed is grounded on the power to refrain from it. But what power can grapple with an opposing eternal necessity? How utterly astounding the position, that the character of an act lies in the *will*, and yet the cause of the act lies as far out of the will as is the Infinite arranger of all motives. The very *attempt* to do otherwise involves the same impossibility as to *achieve* the opposite. For what part of the theory has ever been taught with deeper emphasis, than that the mind must have a different motive in order to vary its volition? how can the mind command a different volition until the needed motive has been present and operated?

Thus, the motive indispensable to the attempt lies forever out of the reach of the agent. An opposite state of mind, or an *attempt* to procure one, lies as far beyond the man's control as is that creative energy which framed the universe. Thus, to curb appetite, to restrain passion, or to practice self-denial, are words without ideas; they can never, in human experience, be a realization. All guilt, self-reproach, fear of penalty, must be the delusions of superstition, and can be readily vanquished by the potency of this theory. It is also fully adequate to dissipate the errors, that blameworthiness attaches to crime and praiseworthiness to virtue. Though this has ever been the judgment of the race, it having been based on the error that the opposites were possible, their impossibility having now been proved, this fallacious judgment must be reversed.

If motives, and not mind, produce volitions, then, as to being *causal*, mind and matter are on common ground; they are links in the

great chain of antecedents and sequences, all their operations being from a power without themselves. They are nature, under the law of necessity, a necessary chain, one link of which can no more be wanting than can an infinite attribute. As we cannot command the motives which produce our volitions, why are we not equally responsible for our incipient feelings and intellections as for our volitions? As the cause of each of these lies out of the mind, and as they can have no character out of their cause, there can be no human vice or human virtue. The theory finds the cause in God; these effects of his will, then, can have no character which he has not. As nothing not good can flow from God, vice is not different from virtue. Their names are inexpressive of ideas.

Whatever makes the *distinction* between vice and virtue impossible makes *them* impossible. The motive cause of volitions, therefore, inaugurates the most absolute OPTIMISM. The so-called crimes that have desolated society, blighted the hopes of ages, and buried nations in a premature grave, differ only in name from the brightest virtues. The two things flow from a common fountain and have a common purpose, and therefore cannot be of opposite natures. Their oneness of character has all the certainty of first principles. The infinity of their source is everlasting security for the identity of their nature.

This makes everything really what it may merely appear to be. Wisdom, folly, truth, falsehood, sincerity, hypocrisy, all opposites, are true if they so appear. As our conceptions of qualities, no less than of things, are from God, how can those be wrong if these be right? Why are they not equally true at all times? How can any error occur while in the entire universe only infinite perfection operates? What appeared true yesterday and appears false to-day must be equally true and false. God having originated both opposing conceptions, it is impossible the contradiction should not be true. But though the theory precludes all liberty in the production of volition, it locates freedom in the *workings* of volition. But if this element resides in the connection between volition and its effects, must it not be equally found between every effect and its antecedent, through the entire series up to the first cause? The theory, therefore, identifies the highest form of liberty with the most stern absolute necessity.

Now the very ground on which liberty is denied to human volition requires that it should also be denied to *Divine volition*. How is it possible to doubt, that if motives can be the only possible cause of volition in some minds they only can be such in all minds? This motive-control making all movements of mind necessary, it

must make all beings and events equally so. The will of God, no less than that of man, must be passive. The terrific tyranny of fate must rule the one no less than the other.

The name we may choose to give to this necessity can alter no feature of its character.

Its stern resistless power sweeps onward, regardless of character and consequences, crushing beneath its iron heel the moral dictates of all minds.

Were the known events of the universe of a benignant character, we might regard this a distinctive of their necessitating cause; were they only diffusive of bliss their cause might be contemplated without horror. But finding deformity, crime, agony, forming the vast range of events in man's history, how can we view the necessitating cause apart from the most odious tyranny?

If falsehood, treachery, murder, and blasphemy be the appropriate expression of the Infinite character, what fate can be too dreadful for the universe to apprehend? What indemnity can it have against howling away in ever augmenting agony the fiery ages of a wasteless future?

This doctrine of the *causality* of motives forces upon us PANTHEISM. The doctrine makes God the author of all motives as he is of all beings, of all volitions as of all motives, of all sequences as of all volitions. It places the Divine mind under this same law which controls all other minds. Extend this chain of antecedents and sequents to any conceivable length, and you change not the relation between the last effect and the first moving cause. Does not this exclude all life, all thought, all efficiency, all kinds of causation, from every being, but eternal necessity? Does it not place the seal of truth on the atheistic argument of Spinoza? God, says he, is the author of all things, acting not from choice, but from necessity; is the author of all vice, of all virtue exhibited in human history. *Cause* and *effect*, then, must be substituted by *substance* and *qualities*, the same reasoning being adapted to *all will* which is applied to human will. If our will cannot be causal God's cannot be. His volitions like ours must flow from unbeginning antecedents. The tendencies and energies that now belong to the Eternal always belonged to *him*. The nature of eternal necessity admits of no variation or beginning. God's volitions are commensurate with his being; this must also be true of all their sequences. Beginning is shut out by necessity alike from both. All we call finite are not God's creatures, but his attributes. They are not creations but developments. The eternity of all volitions is the annihilation of all causation, and by striking cause from the universe the possi-

bility of effect is precluded. Where there is no *creature* there can be no *creator*. Phenomena take the place of creatures, and substance that of Creator. Now as phenomena could not exist without substance, so substance could not be without phenomena. Neither could therefore be before the other. Both alike must be without a beginning. All parts of the mundane system are portions of the always ancient one. What can be more true than the Pantheistic answer to the question, What is God? He is substance and attributes, being and its phenomena. The universe, comprising mind and matter, the clod, the animal, the man, the Deity, all, all are God. This is the crushing conclusion triumphantly forced upon us by this iron agency of fate. If God consists of everything he cannot be a person; so this great distinction of theism is lost amid the common ruins of creative agency.

These are among the shuddering conclusions drawn from the same premises by modern atheists, and they are indubitably true conclusions. Christian necessitarians have failed to reach them, not because logic would lead to any others, not because the laws of thought permitted them to stop short, but because so terrific a result has driven them back for refuge in opposite truths. Had they fearlessly resigned themselves to the eternal laws of evidence; had they, like Spinoza, Hobbes, and Shelley, advanced with an unflinching step from the premises to the conclusion, from necessitated volitions to the denial of creation, atheism must have been their only possible terminus.

ART. VII.—OLSHAUSEN'S NEW TESTAMENT PSYCHOLOGY:

Being a translation of a part of Olshausen's *De Naturæ Humanæ Trichotomia*, N. T. *Scriptoribus Recepta*, among his *Opuscula Theologica*.

THE wisest among the ancient philosophers held man to be the head of the system of nature, embracing in himself the diverse forms of created things, and cognate not less to earth than to heaven. So far as regards the body, the external and visible part of man, they acknowledged the proximity which connects it with inferior animated nature. It obeys the same laws in developing and nourishing individual parts and members. The movements of the body, of the blood, lungs, and heart, the appetites of food and drink, all these are common to him with the lowest orders of animals, although they are found of a much subtler character in

man. Then, so far as relates to the internal and invisible nature of man, they recognized as existent in this animated body a power of knowing, choosing, imagining, and recalling to memory, which faculties the superior races of animals do not altogether lack. Then also they recognized, as peculiar to man alone, a faculty of discoursing, cogitating, and of understanding, and a will, which enables it to use, at its own choice, those superior and inferior powers; to which also self-consciousness is to be added. These single faculties they decided to be so combined in human nature as to render man a single *organism*, (*ὄργανον*,) artistically constructed, a monument of the wisdom of Divinity; created, indeed, for this end, that being released by his own will gradually from the dominion of the inferior forces, he might commit his whole nature to the government of those superior forces which should secure to him an eternal existence. So those two chiefs of the Greek philosophers, Pythagoras and Plato, had taught concerning human nature; of whom the former distinguished between *νοῦς*, the intelligence, or the reason, (*φρον*,) mind, and *θύμος*, affections; and the latter between *νοῦς* or *λόγος*, *θύμος* and *ἐπιθυμία*, or adjectively, between *λογικός*, *θυμικός*, and *ἐπιθυμητικός*. And Zoroaster also (or, at any rate, the disciples of Zoroaster, if you reject the genuine origin of the book *Bundehesch*,) seems to have held the same opinion concerning the partition of human nature. The Jews, also, especially in later times, used the same trichotomy, (or *threefold division*,) in distributing the faculties of human nature. The Septuagint translators palpably set forth this opinion in their version of the memorable passage of Job vii, 15: ἀπαλλάξεις ἀπὸ πνεύματός μου τὴν ψυχὴν μου ἀπὸ δὲ θανάτου τὰ ὀστά μου; literally, *thou releasest my soul from my spirit and my bones from death*.* Josephus, also, uses the same partition, following the doctrine of the Pharisees, which the Rabbins of the more recent age have preserved.† The doctors among the Alexandrian Jews, being skilled in Greek philosophy, followed Plato, as is plentifully evident from the pages of Philo. For this celebrated man distinguishes between the *λογικόν* *θυμικόν* and *ἐπιθυμητικόν*, or the rational, the passional, and the ani-

* The Hebrew words have a different ring מַחַיֵּה מָוֶת. Since מַחַיֵּה signifies suffocation, Doderlein conjectures ἀποπνευματισμὸν; Bahrdt, ἀπο πνέγματος. There is scarce need of conjectural emendation, for the LXX as often translated the sense rather than single words. The phrase ἀπαλλάττειν ψυχὴν ἀπὸ πνεύματος with them simply expressed *to kill*, as in Hebrews v, 12, μερισμὸς ψυχῆς τε καὶ πνεύματος. Romans vi, 6.

† Josephus, *Arch.* i, 1, 2, edit. Haverc., on the creation of man, says: Ἐπλάσεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς λαβὼν καὶ πνεῦμα ἐνέκινεν αὐτῷ καὶ ψυχὴν. The Rabbins also distinguish between מַחַיֵּה מָוֶת, and מַחַיֵּה שָׁמַיִם.

mal. The *ἐπιθυμητικόν* he sometimes called *θρεπτικόν*, the *nutritive*, or *ζωτικόν*, *vitative*; the *θυμικόν*, or *passional*, he calls *αἰσθητικόν*, *æsthetic*. The ecclesiastical fathers, however, received not the phraseology of Plato, but of the Jews; which also the New Testament writers had approved. They always distinguish between *πνεῦμα*, (spirit,) *ψυχή*, (soul,) and *σῶμα*, (body.) For *πνεῦμα* they oftener use *νοῦς*, (for the two words, as we shall see, are cognate;) not unfrequently also *λογος*. The sacred writings oftener use the word *νοῦς*; nor, save once, does the word *λόγος* occur as applied to the faculty of the human mind, (on which topic something fuller hereafter,) and this word they obtain from the philosophers. In the fourth century, when Apollinaris had propounded his opinion concerning the relation between the human and divine nature of the Saviour, (which teaches that the humanity of the Lord was destitute of the *Logos*, (*ἀνθρωπότητα τοῦ κυρίου λογω* caruisse,)* the doctors of the Church receded by degrees from this doctrine, and Gennadius (*De Dogm. Eccl.*, c. 15.) propounds it as the common doctrine of the whole Church, that *the immaterial nature of man was a unit*; by which words it was his intention to impugn the trichotomy of the ancients, which they at that time so misconstrued as to imagine that those ancients taught that man possessed *two souls*! From that time this ancient partition ceased to be held; at any rate, it was not recognized as existing in the books of the New Testament. The terms *πνεῦμα*, *ψυχή*, *νοῦς*, and *καρδία*, were entirely confounded. In our times, at length, there are found those who respect the opinion of antiquity in the interpretation of the sacred books.

It will doubtless appear probable to the reader, from the general prevalence of the idea of this trichotomy among the writers of antiquity, that some traces of it would be found in the sacred books; nevertheless, the common mode of expression of the sacred writers on this subject has escaped the generality of learned men. Of this fact the following appears to us the cause: Interpreters in reading have too anxiously regarded *single words*, and those alone; in which mode of interpretation the words seem nearly interchangeable. It will however appear far otherwise if, looking beyond single words, you also accurately scrutinize their connection, and especially take into consideration the individuals to whom this or that is ascribed; for they use far different modes of expression when a matter refers to Paul, or to the other apostles, and especially to Jesus Christ himself, than when the words relate to the readers or hearers. It is necessary, therefore, that we should more closely

* Apollinaris distinguished between *σαρξ* and *ψυχή ζωτική* and *ψυχή νοητική*.

investigate the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers, that we may know whether any difference exists between *πνεῦμα* and *ψυχή*, so far as they pertain to the faculties of human nature.

1. That the sacred writers made a distinction between these words appears by those passages in which the words occur in conjunction; passages which, unless you would impute the most futile tautologies to the sacred writers, demonstrate that they design some difference between them. I omit the passages, Hebrews iv, 12, 1 Thessalonians v, 23, which set forth a trichotomy in express terms; besides also Philippians i, 27: Ye stand fast in one spirit, *πνεῦμα*, with one mind, *ψυχή*, striving for the faith of the Gospel; and Luke i, 47, to which we may suitably subjoin Exodus xxxv, 21, in which the words *לֵב*, *דָּדָר*, occur conjoined in the same meaning. Finally 1 Corinthians xv., 44: It is sown *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, a *soul-body*; it is raised a *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, *spirit-body*.

2. Then very often there is used in the sacred books a *dualism*, such as we often use in common life, and indeed a dualism of a twofold character. *Σῶμα* and *ψυχή*, *Σὰρξ* and *πνεῦμα*, are put in contrast with each other; one is never used for the other, but they are accurately distinguished.* For *σῶμα*, body, and *ψυχή*, soul, are used where the discourse is concerning man so far as he lives and grows; the visible part of man as an organism is conjoined with the invisible which controls it, (Matt. vi, 25; x., 28; Luke xii, 22, 23.)† *Flesh*, *Σὰρξ*, and spirit, *πνεῦμα*, are used in regard to man so far forth as he thinks and acts, is controlled by desires or controls them; these therefore alone are used always in ethical precepts, (Matt. xxvi, 41; Mark xiv, 38, John iii, 6; Rom. ii, 29; vii, 6; vii., 5; vi, 9; 1 Cor. v, 5; 2 Cor. iii, 6; iv, 4; vii, 1; Gal. iii, 3; iv, 29; v, 17; vi, 8; Phil. iii, 3; Col. ii, 5.) The cause and origin of this difference between each dualism can scarcely be explained otherwise than from that trichotomy which is embraced in the twofold

* Some places are found (Rom. viii, 10; 13; 1 Cor. v, 3; vi, 16; 17, 20; vi, 34; Eph. iv, 4,) which connect *σῶμα*, body, and *πνεῦμα*, spirit, according to common usage; but only in appearance do they recede from the received rule; for in these passages *πνεῦμα* is tantamount to *ψυχή πνευματική* or *πνευματικόν*, concerning which notion further remarks will be made. Otherwise *Σῶμα* and *πνεῦμα* cannot be confined any more than *Σὰρξ* and *ψυχή*. The passage, James ii, 26, for as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works, is rashly drawn to this signification by some. The context shows that spirit here is the *halitus oris*, the breath of the mouth, the external sign of life. The sense of the words is this: as the body without the vital breath is rightly held to be dead, so the believer without works of charity is to be esteemed dead. [A very dubious interpretation.—*Trans.*]

† *Πρόσωπον*, presence, and *κάρδια*, heart, are opposed to each other in a similar way: 2 Cor. v, 1, 2; 1 Thess. ii, 17.

dualism; namely, a distinction is made between *ψυχή*, soul, the inferior life similar to that of animals, and *πνεῦμα*, spirit, the celestial principle by which we are cognate with the Supreme Divinity. But flesh, *σάρξ*, and *σῶμα*, signify the visible part of man; the former that which is of inferior origin; the latter as an instrument artistically constructed for the use of the soul.

3. Finally, the mode of speaking in reference to Christ, Paul, and other holy men, differs from that used in reference to the humbler disciples. Concerning the former almost always *πνεῦμα* is used; concerning Jesus Christ scarce ever is soul, *ψυχή*, or heart, *καρδιά*, used; concerning the latter never is spirit, *πνεῦμα*, used in the same formulas of expression. So we always find *ἀποστενάξαι*, to sigh, *εμβριμάσθαι*, to groan, *ταράσσεσθαι*, to be troubled, *ἐπιγινώσκειν*, to perceive, *παροξύνεσθαι*, to be stirred, *πνεύματι* (Mark viii, 12; John xi, 33; xii, 21; Mark ii, 8; Acts xvii, 16,) *τίθεναι ἐν πνεύματι*, to propose in spirit, *λατρεύειν*, to serve, *στοιχεῖν*, to walk, *ζῆν ἐν πνεύματι*, to live in spirit, (Acts xix, 21; Rom. i, 9; Gal. v, 25; 1 Cor. xvi, 18; 2 Cor. ii, 12; vii, 13; xii, 18; Philem. v, 25, *πνέυμα ἀγαλλιάζει*, (Luke i, 47.) In the same forms of expression also, when the discourse is not about Christ or Paul or other spiritual persons, *heart* is used. It is written *ταράσσεσθαι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, to be disturbed in heart; *λύπη πεπλήρωται ἡ καρδιά*, the heart is filled with grief; *χαρήσεται ἡ καρδιά*, heart shall be rejoiced, (John xiv, 1, 27; xvi, 22,) *τίθεναι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, (Luke i, 66; ii, 19, 51; xxi, 14,) *εὐφρανθῇ ἡ καρδιά*, (Acts ii, 16,) *ἔνδοξεται ἡ ψυχή*, (3 John vii,) *διαπρίεσθαι τῇ καρδίᾳ*, (Acts vii, 54.)

From these explanations it will be clear that the sacred writers made an important difference between spirit, *πνεῦμα*, and soul, *ψυχή*. *Spirit* signifies the higher power, actuating and controlling in man, so that at the same time his celestial origin is indicated; while *soul* signifies the inferior force which is actuated, moved, and held under control; for soul is considered as placed intermediate between the terrestrial and celestial powers.* The interior reason

* This is specially clear from the celebrated passage, Rom. vii, 22, 23. The apostle writes: "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see another law in my members, νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσσι μου, warring against the law of my mind, τῷ νόμῳ τῶν νοῦς μου, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." In this passage the soul, *ψυχή*, that is, the I, is placed between the law of the *νοῦς* or *πνεῦμα*, and the law ἐν τοῖς μέλεσσι, that is the *σάρξ*, flesh, and is, moved either by one or the other. Therefore the *πνεῦμα* and *ψυχή* are never so conjoined that one may seem to belong to the other; never is said or can be said *ψυχὴ τοῦ πνεύματος*, nor *πνεῦμα τῆς ψυχῆς* or *καρδίας*. But we allow such forms as *πνεῦμα τῶν νοῦς*, (Eph. iv, 23,) and *νοῦς σαρκός*, (Col. ii, 18,) concerning which forms more will yet be said.

and influence which actuate the individual man is called the spirit; as the spirit of bondage, of adoption, (Rom. viii, 15,) of fear, and of love; (2 Tim. i, 7; Rom. xv, 30; 1 Cor. iv, 21; Eph. i, 17; Gal. vi, 1.) So far forth as a man is controlled by the precepts of the Divine Spirit, he is called πνευματικός, spiritual, 1 Cor. ii, 14, 15; iii, 1; Gal. vi, 1; so far forth as he is not so governed he is called ψυχικός, animal, or σαρκικός, fleshly. Jude 9, (ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες,) animal, not having the spirit. In James iii, 15, the terms (ἐπίγειος, ψυχική, δαιμονιώδης,) earthly, animal, devilish are conjoined. Ψυχή, that which is actuated or moved, is often interchanged with καρδιά, in a broader sense; for *heart* the Scriptures teach to be the seat of the soul.* This is deducible from numerous texts of Scripture, for instance 1 Thessalonians iii, 13; James v, 8; 2 Peter ii, 14. In First Thessalonians the phrase *in presence, not in heart*, is used for *in body, not in soul*. This appears from Colossians ii, 5, where the same idea is expressed by the terms *flesh and spirit*. A double dualism thence recurs between *body and soul, flesh and spirit*. Hence the formulas of speech *to joy, to grieve, to be disturbed, to be rejoiced in heart*, (John xiv, 1; xxvii, 16; Acts ii, 26,) are to be interpreted the *soul in the heart* rejoices, grieves, etc. Nevertheless for the most part a distinction is so made between *soul and heart* in its broader sense that soul signifies the inferior life of man so far forth as it grows and exists; heart so far as it feels and is actuated or moved by spirit or flesh. For this reason we have the phrases *to save the soul, salvation of souls*, (James i, 21; v, 20; 1 Peter i, 9; Heb. x, 39;) never is found to *save the heart* or the *spirit*. The verbs *darkened, made gross, hardened*, are predicated of *heart*, (Rom. i, 21; Acts xxviii, 27; Eph. iv, 18; Mark iii, 5; vi, 52; viii, 17; John xii, 40,) slow, hard in heart, (Luke xxiv, 25; Mark xvi, 14; Heb. iii, 8, 15) never *soul is darkened*, etc.; nevertheless διψυχος, two-souled, is used, (James i, 8,) where heart is

* In the same way Philo (De Spec. Leg., vol. ii, p. 350, edit. Mangey) says: Λόγῳ μὲν ὡς ἡγεμόνι τὴν ἄκρον ἀπένειμαν οἰκειοσάτων ἐνδιαίτημα κεφαλὴν, ἐνθα καὶ τῶν αἰσθήσεων αἱ τοῦ νοῦ καθάπερ βασιλεὺς δορυφόροι τάξεις παρίδρυνται· θύμῳ τὰ στήρνα, ἐπιθυμία δὲ τὸν περὶ τὸν θυμὸν καὶ τὸ καλόμενον διάφραγμα χώρον. To the *reason*, as the chief, we attribute as the most appropriate residence the *head*, around which the *perceptions* stand like ranks of *soldiers*; to the *passions* are assigned the *breast*; to the *appetites* the region around the *navel* and *diaphragm*. Again: (De legg. alleg. i, opp. vol. i, p. 57) τοῦ μὲν λογικοῦ συμβέβηκε εἶναι χώριον καὶ ἐνδιαίτημα κεφαλὴν; τοῦ δὲ θυμικοῦ τὰ στήρνα; τοῦ ἐπιθυμητικοῦ, τὸ ἱτρὸν. So also Pythagoras taught τὸ μὲν ζωτικὸν περὶ τὴν καρδίαν, τὸ δὲ λογικὸν καὶ νοερὸν περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν εἶναι. (Plut. Deor. Phys., II, c. 5; Cicero, Tusc. IV. 5.)

said to be moved by good as well as evil; that is, the man is divided into a soul fleshly and soul spiritual, *ψυχὴν σαρκικὴν* and *πνευματικὴν*. By this partition we explain the words of our Lord, *He that findeth his life (soul, fleshly or animal) shall lose it, (spiritual,) and he that loseth his life (soul, fleshly or animal) shall find it, (spiritual.)* Matt. x, 39; xvi, 2; Mark viii, 35. Christ also says: "I came to give my life (soul, spiritual) a ransom for many." A man never ceases to be *ψυχή** even if he ceases to be *ψυχικός*.

Each part of the man, both the soul and the spirit, is active in a different way, according to which it is designated by different terms. *Spirit* cogitates and understands, and then is called *νοῦς*, *reason*. *Soul* perceives, and therefore is called *σύνεσις*, *understanding*.

Νοῦς, *the reason*, and its cognate words *νοεῖν*, *κατανοεῖν*, *νονεῖν*, in the philosophers are interchanged with *λόγος*,† *the reason*, or *the word*, but is scarcely ever in the New Testament. Sometimes it is interchanged with *διάνοια* and *ἐννοια*, 1 Peter i, 13; iv, 1; Matt. xxii, 37; Mark xii, 30, (in which passages it is rendered *mind*.) But *ἐπίνοια*, (Acts viii, 22,) *ὑπόνοια*, (1 Timothy vi, 4,) *διαλογισμός*, (Luke ii, 35; xxiv, 38,) signify the same things as *διανόημα*,‡ namely, *thoughts*, *ideas*, or single actions of the *νοῦς*

* Origen derives *ψυχή* from *ψυξις*, a *refreshing*, because it lives by the divine breath, *ἀπο τοῦ ζῆν ἐν πνεύματι*. He intimates by this that the soul merges by degrees; *ψυχή* κατορθωθείσα γίνεται *νοῦς*, *the soul rightly regulated becomes spirit*. Origen evidently is led into this error by his idealism; for as the body never dissolves into soul, so soul never dissolves into spirit. Each part of man retains its own nature, although gradually illustrated by the Divine splendor.

† The Platonists principally use the word *λόγος* and *λογικόν* as we have just above intimated. In the New Testament ὁ *λόγος*, Acts xviii, 14, is so used; more often occurs *λογικός*, (Rom. xii, 1; 1 Pet. ii, 2,) with the same meaning as *νοητός* and *άλογος*, 2 Pet. ii, 12. *Ἰude άλογα ζωά*, same as *φυσικά*, with which is to be compared Jude 19, where the same heretics are called *ψυχικοί*, *πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες*. Then there occurs *λογισμός*, (Rom. ii, 15; 2 Cor. x, 5,) meaning the same as *νοημα*, that is, single actions of the *λόγος* or *νοῦς*, and in composition *διαλογισμός* *διαλογίζεσθαι*, *συλλογίζεσθαι*. In their use of these words we clearly trace the same sense which the Greek philosophers attribute to *λόγος*. Everywhere, also, the sacred writers trace things back to their primary source; so that discourse is attributed to the *λόγος*, (as we have lately discussed,) and also they distinguish between *νοῦς* and the interior source of the *νοῦς*, namely, the *πνεῦμα* which Plato had neglected.

‡ *Διάνοια*, however, more frequently occurs in the same sense which we have claimed for *νοῦς*, excepting in Luke i, 51, Eph. ii, 3, where it has the same force as *διανόημα*. Compare Heb. viii, 10, x, 16, *διδούσ νόμους εἰς τὴν διανοαν*, with Rom. vii, 23. Not without difficulty is the passage, Eph. iv, 17, 18, *τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοῦς αὐτῶν ἐσκοτισμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ*. Instead of *ματαιότης του νοῦς*, one would rather have expected *ματαιότης*

or λόγος. The difference, also, between νοῦς and πνεῦμα is evinced by those passages where both terms are conjoined, as *ἀνανεοῦσθαι τῷ πνεύματι** τοῦ νοός (Eph. iv, 23), and from the celebrated passage, Rom. vii, 23-25. For there we find νόμος τοῦ νοός, the law of the mind, and νόμος ἐν μέλεσι, that is, σαρκός, opposed to each other; always, also, are πνεῦμα and σὰρξ found in antithesis, and never is νόμος τῆς καρδίας or ψυχῆς said. For the καρδιά is controlled by one or the other of those laws. On account of this in Rom. viii, 2 πνεῦμα is placed where before νοῦς was read, and law of the πνεῦμα is opposed to the law of ἁμαρτία, sin. For the πνεῦμα ἐν τῷ νοῖ νοεῖ, *cogitates in the mind*, just as sin renders itself efficacious ἐν τῇ σαρκί, *in the flesh*. When νοεῖν and συνιέναι are conjoined they are by no means mere synonyms; the former is referred to the πνεῦμα, the latter to the ψυχή.†

Σύνεσις, *sagacity, discernment*, with its cognates συνιέναι, συνετός, is not only distinguished from νοῦς and νοεῖν, (Mark viii, 17,) but is everywhere expressly referred to the καρδιά. (Matt. xiii, 13, 14, 15; Mark ix, 52; Acts xxviii, 27, καρδιά ασύνετος. Rom.

τῆς καρδίας, or ἐσκοτισμένοι τῇ καρδίᾳ. The passage is to be so understood that διάνοια may be taken for διανοαίς; then the sense of the words is this: the Gentiles live in the vanity of their minds, by which their thoughts (gedanken) are darkened. The words διάνοια, διαλογισμός, and their synonyms above quoted, taken by themselves, denote actions of the νοῦς; but whenever the νοῦς is excited by the καρδιά they are attributed to the καρδιά.

° Πνέυμα τὸν νοός cannot well be said, nor νοῦς τοῦ πνεύματος, since always the νοῦς is of the πνεῦμα alone. We find once in the New Testament νοῦς τῆς σαρκός, (Colossians ii, 18;) but this mode of expression is a oxymoron, indicating an unnatural condition of mind, in which the highest faculties serve the concupiscence; the νοῦς is rendered σαρκικός and το φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστί. Matt. vi, 23.

† Once, indeed, νοεῖν καρδιά occurs. John xii, 40. But these words are cited from Isaiah vi, 9, 10, where the Septuagint reads συνιέναι καρδιά, (נִבְּנָה,) and where the same passage is elsewhere quoted in the New Testament, Matt. xiii, 15; Mark iv, 12; Luke viii, 10; Acts xxviii, 26, 27, συνιέναι is always used. I am therefore inclined to believe that John xii, 14 needs emendation. . . . I would give additional caution that no one should be stumbled by 1 Cor. xiv, where ψάλλειν, λαλεῖν πνεύματι and νοεῖν, to sing, to speak with the spirit and the understanding, as it were opposed to each other as being contraries. It is plain from 1 Cor. xiv, 9, that ἐν πνεύματι λαλεῖν signifies the same as ἐν γλώσσῃ λαλεῖν, to speak with a tongue; that is, φέρεσθαι, that is, to be borne along by the power of the Holy Spirit, in the manner of the ancient prophets, (2 Peter i, 21,) rather than ἄγεσθαι, to be dragged by the force of a possessing spirit. (Rom. viii, 11, 14; Gal. v, 18.) On the other hand νοεῖν λαλεῖν, same as προφητεύειν, to prophesy, that is, to discourse concerning divine things, under influence of the Divine Spirit, but not without individual consciousness.

i, 21. Wherefore *συνεαίς* and *συνετός* by themselves pertain to things inferior and terrestrial, and are held as little worth in divine things: *την συνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν αθετησῶ*. 1 Cor. i, 19. For the most part *συνετός* is used of those who seem to act prudently or sagaciously. (Matt. xi, 25; Luke x, 21.) The man also who obeys the laws of the *νοῦς* and *πνεῦμα* by degrees receives *σύνεσιν πνευματικὴν*, a spiritual understanding, sagacity, or discernment, and so the word is to be understood when it refers to heavenly things. Eph. iii, 4; 2 Tim. ii, 7.

The sacred writers attribute to the *πνεῦμα* and *ψυχή*, not only the power of understanding and perceiving, but free will, which, being exempt from bonds, gradually enlarges to the true freedom, which is able to choose and to accomplish the right and excellent. The will of the *πνεῦμα* is called *φρενές*;^{*} the choice of the *ψυχή* is attributed to the *καρδία*, which two volitional tendencies we commonly term *desire* and *appetite*.

Φρένες occurs once only in the New Testament, 1 Cor. xiv, 20, from which passage the true meaning of the word is not very clear. In Rom. vii, 28, and viii, 6, we find in antithesis the combinations *φρόνημα σαρκός* and *πνεύματος*, just as we have already found the combination of *νοῦς σαρκός*. Then *φρόνησις*, (Eph. i, 8; Luke i, 17,) *φρόνιμος*, (Matt. vii, 24; x, 16; xxiv, 55; xxv, 2,) are almost always used for a laudable prudence of the *πνεῦμα*. *Συνετός*, we have already seen, is not so used; *φρονιμῶς* (Luke xvi, 8) has about the same signification as *νοῦν*. (Mark xii, 34.) From this signification of the word *φρονεῖν*, to be minded, (Philippians ii, 5,) we can best understand the difference between *ταπεινός* and *ταπεινόφρων*, *φιλῶν* and *φιλόφρων*, and other similar words. He is called *ταπεινός*, humble, who is so simply; *ταπεινόφρων*, humble-minded, who is humble by conscious purpose. According to this division of the faculties we may easily understand that *σοφία* is in the *φρόν*, that *γνώσις* is in the *νοῦς*, and *πίστις* is in the *καρδία*.

Ψυχή, also, so far as it has volition, desire, appetency, is in the

^aPythagoras (if we may credit Diogenes Laertius viii, 20) held that *φρόν* was the highest faculty in man: *τὴν δὲ ἀνθρώπου ψυχὴν διαμερίζεται τριχῇ εἰς τὴν νοῦν καὶ φρενὰς καὶ θέμον*. *Νοῦν μὲν οὖν εἶναι καὶ θέμον καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις ζώοις; φρενὰς δὲ μόνον ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ*. This, in a manner, agrees with a familiar use in the New Testament writers, for they use *φρόνημα* to mean the intending, the directing the will toward a known aim. But I am scarce able to persuade myself that Pythagoras attributed *νοῦς* to animals. Stobæus (Eccl. Phys., p. 878) imputes to the Pythagoreans another partition into *λογισμὸν θέμον καὶ ἐπιθέμαν*; but these seem rather to have been the views of the Platonists, with which he seems to have confounded the Pythagorean doctrine.

New Testament called *καρδία* in a stricter sense. It is most difficult of all accurately to define what difference exists in the New Testament between *ψυχή* and *καρδία*.* Often, as we have seen above, they are interchanged; *καρδία* is put for *ψυχή*, since the (physical) *heart* is held as the seat and, as it were, the receptacle of the soul, just as the head of the intellect; neither, nevertheless, is either word used promiscuously; but *ψυχή* is spoken of in so far as it *exists*, but *καρδία* so far as it is excited, or the subject of emotion.

In other passages a difference is broadly made between *ψυχή* and *καρδία*, as Acts iv. The multitude of believers was one *καρδία* and *ψυχή*.† And especially these parallel passages:

Matt. xxii, 37: *καρδία, ψυχή, διάνοια*.

Mark xii, 30: *καρδία, διάνοια, ἰσχυς*.

Luke x, 27: *καρδία, ψυχή, ἰσχυς, διάνοια*.

Mark xii, 33: *καρδία, σύνεσις, ψυχή, ἰσχυς*.

Deut. vi, 5, (Septuagint:) *διάνοια, ψυχή, δύναμις*.

Heb. כַּחַד לִבְּךָ נַפְשְׁךָ וְכֹחְךָ.

So far as we can see, to *καρδία*, in these passages, is attributed *desire*; so that the series of terms may be rendered (German, *begehrkraft, lebenskraft, denkkraft, willenskraft*) affection-power, life-power, thought-faculty, volition-power. Nevertheless, the usages of the New Testament writers is not everywhere uniform. In Eph. vi, 6, Col. iii, 23, *ψυχή* is found, where the context, according to our rule, requires *καρδία*, (as Luther also renders it, *herz*,) which is the word used in Rom. vi, 17, and 1 Tim. i, 15, in a similar round of expression. In Mark *σύνεσις* is to be taken for *διάνοια*, that is, for the *σύνεσις πνευματική*.

Finally, concerning the notion of *σῶμα*, *body*, we subjoin a few remarks. *Σῶμα*, derived from *σάος, σός, σῶς*, is used to designate the body as the instrument of the soul, (*σῶμα ὀργανικόν*, as it is

* *Θῆμος* was used among the Greek philosophers, as passages already quoted plentifully demonstrate. In the New Testament *θῆμος* (Apocalypse xiv, 10; i, 7; xix, 15) always signifies *anger, wrath*. The words *ἐνθουμῆσθαι, ἐνθουμήσεις* are found (Matt. ix, 4; xii, 25; Heb. iv, 12) pertaining to the *καρδία*, a sense familiar to the same word with the philosophers. Here also belongs the word *ομοθυμαδόν*, (Acts i, 14; iv, 1, 46; iv, 24,) which in Acts iv, 32 is expressed by the phrase *τὸ πλῆθος ἦν ἡ καρδία καὶ ἡ ψυχή μία*.

† 1 Cor. i, 10: 'Εν τῷ αὐτῷ νοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ. These words pertain rather to unity in views; the passage Acts iv, 32, to unity in love.

‡ So Gregory Nyssen, (*De Anim. et Resurr. Opp.*, vol. i, p. 189,) *ψυχή ἐστιν οὐσία ζῶσα σώματι ὀργανικῷ καὶ αἰσθητικῷ δύνανται ζωτικὴν καὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἀντιληπτικὴν δι' ἐαυτῆς ἐνιδύσα*. And Athanasius, (*Opp.*, vol. ii, p. 49,) *ἡ ψυχή ἐκ τῆς οἰκείας ἐνεργείας ἔχει τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς προσηγορίαν. Ξύχειν γὰρ τὸ ζῶσποιεῖν λέγεται, διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ τῆς ζωποιοῦ ψυχῆ λέγεται διὰ τὸ σῶμα ζῶσποιεῖν*.

called by Gregory Nyssen,) and like the parallel Hebrew בשר , בשר , it is used for the most part concerning the living body, but sometimes also for the dead. Usually the word for the dead body is πτῶμα . Σάρξ , *flesh*, is the material of the body while living; κρεας , *meat*, when dead. But our present business is not with body as the organ of soul; neither with flesh as its material; but with *flesh* as an affectional power in the καρδιά .* For σάρξ is the seat of the ἐπιθυμιαί , (commonly translated *lusts*,)† and παθημάτα , passions; and on account of this is often put for concupiscence, as in Rom. vii, 18, there *dwelleth in me*, that is, ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου , *no good thing*; which in verse 23 is expressed by $\text{ἐν τοῖς μέλεσι μου}$. This passage is important for elucidating the difference which exists between σάρξ and σῶμα , so far as each term designates the seat and origin of ἐπιθυμιαί , lusts or propensities. For σάρξ , which nearly always is used concerning men liable to sin, signifies, upon the whole, the infirm part of human nature, of terrene origin, the seat of concupiscence, so that it is almost interchangeable with ἀμαρτία . The fact, however, is otherwise when the σάρξ of Christ is adumbrated, inasmuch as the Son of God shared his own nature with his his own flesh. As σῶμα signifies a complex or system of individual members, so it comprehends, also, the operations, individual and collective, of the σάρξ and ἀμαρτία . On this account we have the combinations, σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς , *body of the flesh*, (Col. ii, 11,) and σῶμα τοῦ θανάτου , *body of death*, Rom. vii, 24, which is the same as τὰ μέλη , *the members*, v. 23. Compare Rom. viii, 11, 13. As being the seat of concupiscence, σῶμα , *the body*, is called θνητόν ,

* 1 Cor. vi, 16: 'Ο κολλώμενος τῇ πόρνῃ ἐν σῶμα ἔστιν, ἔσονται γάρ φησὶν οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. 'Ο δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν πνεῦμα ἔστι. This passage does not prove the signification of σῶμα and σάρξ to be the same; σῶμα and πνεῦμα are here simply set in opposition, as in Cor. v, 3, and for this reason we have the phrase ἐν σῶμα . But, in 1 Cor. ix, 27, σῶμα seems to be put for σάρξ . The image which the apostle wished to carry out, (of an athlete,) induced the use of σῶμα instead of σάρξ .

† For these reasons philosophers, not descending to ultimate causes, call a third part of human nature ἐπιθυμία or ἐπιθυμητικόν , (a fact intelligible from passages already quoted,) putting particular actions or operations for their cause. To concupiscence they allot a certain locality in the human frame. Philo, (De Spec. Legg., vol. ii, p. 350,) $\text{ἐπιθυμία δὲ τὸν περὶ τὸν ὀμφαλὸν καὶ τὸ καλούμενον διάφραγμα χώρον ἔχει}$. And also, (De Leg. Alleg., vol. i, p. 57,) $\text{τοῦ δὲ ἐπιθυμητικοῦ συμβέβηκε τὸ χώριον εἶναι τὸ ἱερόν}$. [These passages we shall leave in their garb of "well-sounding Greek." *Trans.*] In the New Testament there once occurs, Rev. ii, 23, νέφροι , *reins*, as the seat of lusts. So the Hebrew כִּלְכִּילִים in the Old Testament often. Σπλάγχνα , *bowels*, is always used in a good sense, namely, concerning love, and indeed concerning maternal love. Σπλάγνα , that is, רֵחַם , seems to be derived *ab utero*.

mortal, Rom. vi, 12, and the *ψυχή* is held bound by the fetters of the sin of the body, and is *δούλος ἐστὶ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας*, (Rom. vii, 25.) When this is the case the *σῶμα* is merely *ψυχικόν*. By the power of Christ the soul is emancipated from these bonds, the body itself is rendered *πνευματικόν*, (1 Cor. xv, 44;) and when our body is *μετασχηματισθεῖς*, *transfigured*, even the *ἐπιθυμίαι*, lusts of our immaterial nature, depart. On this account, in a few passages, the word *ἐπιθυμίαι*, used of the *πνευματικῶι*, or spiritual, is used in a good sense. Jesus himself says, *ἐπιθυμία ἐπιθύμησα*; literally, *with lust have I lusted to eat this passover*. Luke xxii, 15. See also Phil. i, 27; 1 Thes. ii, 17, where it is used concerning Paul

ART. VIII.—MISSIONS IN AMERICA.

[THIRD ARTICLE.]

THE extent and character of the American missionary field have been briefly sketched in two preceding articles in this Review. A glance at the uncultivated wastes as therein presented, containing millions of Indians, millions of men of foreign birth and tongue, millions who speak our own language, and millions more crowding over our borders from the North, and the South, and the East, all dependent upon the American Churches for spiritual instruction and salvation, instrumentally, is surely sufficient to cause us to feel the unequalled importance of our home work. What a home God has bestowed upon us! From sea to sea, and from the North to the South Pole. Such a home as no other people have had or can have. The Almighty has made but one, and there is not room for another such on the broad bosom of mother earth.

The political and religious importance of our American home is unreckoned. We would not have this considered an empty boast characteristic of national vanity. Older members of the family of nations should not be offended by it. We are now what they were once, a young and vigorous people. They grew to opulence, to influence and greatness, and wielded the destinies of the world. The path of progress is now opened before us, and we must advance in it; we must increase; comparatively they must decrease. As the world's destiny has been in their hands, so it must pass into ours. And as each successive nation has risen higher in moral power and

position, we believe it is God's order that the last should rise highest. As the increasing force of favorable circumstances mounts each succeeding generation of men upon the shoulders of the preceding one, so are nations elevated by each other. Untrodden heights of power and influence are beckoning the American nation onward, and with long and rapid strides she is ascending them. And with the highest national position comes the weightiest national responsibilities. Hence the importance that the American nation should be Christian, thoroughly Christian. Her own dangerous destiny and controlling influence upon the world at large demand it.

Her political importance is seen and acknowledged, not only by politicians in the New, but in the Old World. In this respect the children of the world seem wiser in their generation than the children of light. The language of one of our statesmen upon a recent occasion is full of significant truth. He says: "We, the people of the United States, have a predestined fate before us, plain to be seen, according to my thought, as if inscribed on the adamantine leaves of time with a pencil of fire. Nay; it is as a providential mission, assigned to us by the visible, outstretched finger of God. . . . It is the foundation in America of republican empires: to outcount in numbers, and outvie in strength, the parent states of Europe. I say that it is the work appointed of God for us to do, and with the blessing of God upon us, that work we will do." This is assigning to America a transcendent political importance. The eye of the statesman traces its outline and reads its history in the future.

Where is the seer on the watch-hills of Christianity, and what is his report? Is there not a religious future as magnificent and important for America as her political? Is the finger of God's providence visible only to the statesman? Has he no providential designs to be wrought out on this great continent for the *universal spread of Christianity*? Surely he has. And the Church should apprehend them, and gird herself for their instrumental accomplishment. The American Churches have at the present hour work enough at home to employ all their energies, and the future opens before them upon a scale of grandeur and usefulness unlimited. Here is their work. The remark of the Rev. J. Angel James to an American divine, showed that he fully appreciated the circumstances of the American Churches. He said that "America ought to be exempt from missionary effort," meaning foreign missionary effort; and exempt in view of her duties at home. A man sitting at the base of one of the great Egyptian pyramids would not be able

to form so correct a conception and receive so distinct an idea of its outline and vast proportions as if he viewed it from a distance. So with great moral enterprises; too close a contact is unfavorable for a correct appreciation of their greatness and importance. A striking illustration is furnished, we think, by the American Churches, in their estimate of the missionary work. They should be at a distance to perceive the importance of their work at home. God grant that they may ascend the mount of vision!

Undoubtedly the great duty of the Church of God is to evangelize the world. The only question in discussion is, the best method of reaching this result. Her first and only commission of duty from her Divine founder was a missionary one. It was, "Go," *beginning at Jerusalem*, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." The work was missionary work, all missionary work; and as much so in Palestine as in Macedonia, in Jerusalem as in Athens or Corinth. And the work of evangelizing the world is as much missionary now in America and England, as in Africa or India. The work is the same everywhere; the Church of Christ is at home everywhere. The demands and the locality, for individual or Church labor, must be determined by circumstances. We doubt whether evils have not arisen from the technical and restricted application of the phrase "Missionary Work" to distant fields. It gives the Church imperfect views of duty and responsibility. These views should be as universal as the world, and particular as each individual. It has a tendency to lead to the neglect of work at hand, which could be carefully superintended and effectually accomplished, for work in the distance, beyond our immediate control, imperfectly known by us, and consequently inefficiently conducted. It has caused advocates of the conversion of the world to rely upon doubtful representations, drawn from the Devil-bush of Africa and the banks of the Ganges, to excite the Church to duty, while valleys of dry bones, exceedingly dry, lie unexplored and unnoticed near our doors.

And further: Some of the zealous advocates of missions, in this restricted sense, affirm, with all the freshness and force of a newly discovered truth, that the spirit of missions is *the life* of the Church, and that this life is measured, and bounded, and proportioned by her missionary operations. Indeed, these operations are sometimes presented as if they were the sources of her spiritual life and power. This, we think, is too strong a representation. It is certainly true that the missionary spirit is essentially connected with the life of the Church. It is elemental. It had its birth with Christianity. It is an epitome of Christianity. It has always been found in active

connection with it, and truly measuring its vital force. But this is not a discovery in connection with modern missions, and should not be so represented. It is old Christianity, and has more weight of authority, legitimately occupying the seat of the ancient. The missionary spirit is not the life of the Church, nor missionary operations the source of that life. Directly the opposite is true. The life of the Church must be the source of this spirit, and of these activities, if they are at all Christian. Missionary activities may exist independent of true Christian life, both in individuals and churches. We have an example in the Romish Church; and Protestantism might become what Romanism is—a great organization of propagandism. We must not give, even to the great missionary interest, an undue importance. The life of the true Church is infused by the Holy Ghost; it is a baptism of power from on high. Her missionary life and order of work are both found in the fulfillment of the Saviour's promise: "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." Acts i, 8. We certainly think that such representations and teachings are defective and deleterious, and the sooner they are abandoned the better for the Church and the world. There is a species of enchantment about it that savors more of policy than piety. In a true sense the entire work of the Church is missionary work. And, as with an individual, so with a Church, the first duty is that nearest at hand. And by performing each duty at the proper time and place, we pursue the only certain method of accomplishing our whole duty efficiently. To be in haste to do some great thing or distant thing, to the neglect of a small thing, or thing near at hand, will certainly result in an imperfect discharge of duty. Churches are in as great danger from this error as persons are, and the principle is applicable to the great Church work contemplated.

It is very certain that a thorough performance of our home work is for us the most *efficient system for the conversion of the world*. It is the philosophical plan of operations to work from the center to the extremities. At the center is the seat of life, and this must be cherished, or labor will cease. Neither this view nor its application is new with the writer of these articles. Rev. L. P. Hickok, D.D., in a sermon before the American Home Missionary Society, makes this emphatic declaration: "On the saving of the American Church and people depends the salvation of the whole world." The English Wesleyans, so justly celebrated for their labors in the foreign mission field, have recently turned their attention to home with

a hearty appreciation of its importance, worthy of imitation. Rev. Mr. Waddy, in his address before the Wesleyan Missionary Society at its last anniversary, remarked that "*Home missions have the first claim upon the society.*" He said: "To impoverish these for the sake of foreign missions would be to eat up your seed-corn. Exertions for missions have had a wonderful effect in enlarging the scale of all home efforts. On the other hand it is only by the spread of home institutions that the permanent basis of foreign enterprise is widened. Whenever we hear of either individuals or societies, who give liberally to foreign and sparingly to home claims, we look upon them as probably very good, but ill-taught and eccentric. The plea that any part of our population is as badly off as the heathen, is untrue. But the certainty that all Christian labor expended upon them will permanently bear fruit of men and money for missionary work, stamps all advances toward the conversion of England with a world-wide value." This is much for an English Wesleyan to say, and to say, too, on the great occasion of their missionary anniversary. Their foreign missions have been their pride, and an all-absorbing interest. Their English home was neglected, and the effect of this neglect has been manifesting itself in the loss of their hold upon the poorer classes of society, in the regeneration of whom the chief glory and strength of any Church are to be found. They have happily discovered their error, and set about repairing it in good earnest. May we be timely cautioned; never commit, and never have cause to repair such an error. The above quotation, so true of the importance of England's conversion, is doubly true when applied to America. And it recognizes also the principle of converting the world through the effectual cultivation of the home field.

Bishop Simpson, in his address before the English Wesleyan Conference, as a delegate from the Methodist Episcopal Church, said: "Your system has displayed itself in missionary operations beyond ours. We have done something, but not so much as you have done. I hope, however, we shall follow you with more equal steps by and by. At present there is this difference in our circumstances: your land is filled with population; your cities are built; your ground is circumscribed; and all you can do is by the extension of your work abroad. It is not so with us. Since my own short day, for it was my lot to be born in a Western frontier, where the Indian tribes were roaming but a few miles distant, I have seen the frontier of our country extend between fifteen hundred and two thousand miles westward. This being the case, we were obliged to follow the population. Methodist ministers have gone after the

settler, and where the latter built his cabin the former would tie his horse to a tree, and taking his Bible and Hymn Book out of his saddle-bags, would preach Christ crucified. Hosts of the Irish Romanist population have been poured upon our shores, with hundreds and thousands of Germans; and now unless we have missionary operations among them they will overwhelm us. *We do not need to go out to the world, for the world is coming to us to be evangelized.*" And the out-going into the world from this home operation is beautifully set forth by the bishop in the same address: "I desire here, also, to explain what may seem to you to be an intrusion, that while we are forming a conference in Germany, it is not from rivalry, or because we would trench upon your labors, but because God sent the Germans among us. You had no field for them. Among us they were converted. . . . The converted Germans sent letters to their friends at home, and you may imagine the effect! The old man and woman would be gathered around the family hearth, and as the letter from their son in America was read, the old man would sit listening, and the mother would sit with tears in her eyes to hear from her son: that he was well, and had got a home, and a family springing up; that he had been to a Methodist Church, and had heard a Gospel sermon, and that it had pleased God to awaken him, and to forgive him his sins through faith in Jesus Christ. This would prove an unexpected sermon to them, this news of the conversion of their dear boy, and all the minister's preaching for years would not make such an impression as that short letter; it was a living witness among them of the power of God to salvation. The police could not stop those letters; they might stop ministers, examine goods, imprison men; but these letters, like snow-flakes floating in the air on a winter's day, would drop upon all. These letters had crossed the Atlantic, and had begun to evangelize that land, whose inhabitants now called to American Methodists, as the company in New York called to John Wesley, 'Send us men.' 'Come over and help us.'" Again: "The Scandinavians came over to us. . . . We did not wish to go to Norway; we had no thought of it; but one of our converts went home full of love and fire, and without being sent by the missionary society, he told the story of the cross as soon as he landed; the people wept, some were converted, and the cry came, 'Send a missionary!' and now we have three there,* and they have raised up native helpers, and God has opened a door for a work, though to a limited degree." By the same home operation we have been led to Denmark and Sweden. Of these missions, established among the for-

* Increased since.

eign populations in our own country, the last annual report of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church says, referring particularly to the Swedish Mission in New York city: "It is the battery which sends back its evangelical shocks to Europe, to awaken a religious concern in old Scandinavia." Beautifully and powerfully said; and by cultivating American home interests faithfully and fully, the shocks of our evangelical battery will soon be sufficient to awaken the world!

We have an impressive illustration of the truth of this position in the contrast existing between Moravianism and Methodism. They commenced their career about the same time, with about equal original advantages and qualifications. Each clearly apprehending and embracing experimental and practical Christianity, both baptized with power from on high, they entered the great field, the world, for labor. *One hundred and twenty-five years ago* Moravianism entered the field of foreign missions. They went north to Greenland, and south to the West India Islands. In less than *nine years* they had missionaries in Greenland, St. Thomas, St. Croix, Surinam, Berbice, Lapland, Guiana, and Ceylon; at the Cape of Good Hope, in Africa, among the Indians in North America, and the Negroes of South Carolina. These were gigantic and praiseworthy efforts; but they consumed their strength and exhausted the fountain of life, and to-day the weight of Moravianism is scarcely felt in Christendom, and her power for doing good abroad is in the same proportion feeble. Methodism devoted itself to laying broad foundations in nominal Christian lands; the sanctification of civilization; to the cultivation and concentration of moral power; to spreading Scriptural holiness; and the consequence is, in her own organization she is the strongest element in the Christian world, which, in addition to the indirect influence exerted upon sister Churches by the diffusion and infusion of her own spirit of life, warrants the conclusion that Methodism, since her origin, has done and is doing more for the *conversion of the world than all influences beside*. And this she has done by working at home. Home work is the true system for evangelizing the world. Strength at home gives efficiency abroad. And our home in the hearts of the people depends on our attention to their interests. Behold the contrast between Moravianism and Methodism after the labors of one hundred and twenty-five years: the one upon the foreign, and the other upon the principle of home work! It is questionable whether, if Moravianism had done her work as effectually in Germany as Methodism did hers in England, neology would have swept over that country, subverting revealed religion, or that Methodism would be called upon to-day to spend

settler, and where the latter built his cabin the former would tie his horse to a tree, and taking his Bible and Hymn Book out of his saddle-bags, would preach Christ crucified. Hosts of the Irish Romanist population have been poured upon our shores, with hundreds and thousands of Germans; and now unless we have missionary operations among them they will overwhelm us. *We do not need to go out to the world, for the world is coming to us to be evangelized.*" And the out-going into the world from this home operation is beautifully set forth by the bishop in the same address: "I desire here, also, to explain what may seem to you to be an intrusion, that while we are forming a conference in Germany, it is not from rivalry, or because we would trench upon your labors, but because God sent the Germans among us. You had no field for them. Among us they were converted. . . . The converted Germans sent letters to their friends at home, and you may imagine the effect! The old man and woman would be gathered around the family hearth, and as the letter from their son in America was read, the old man would sit listening, and the mother would sit with tears in her eyes to hear from her son: that he was well, and had got a home, and a family springing up; that he had been to a Methodist Church, and had heard a Gospel sermon, and that it had pleased God to awaken him, and to forgive him his sins through faith in Jesus Christ. This would prove an unexpected sermon to them, this news of the conversion of their dear boy, and all the minister's preaching for years would not make such an impression as that short letter; it was a living witness among them of the power of God to salvation. The police could not stop those letters; they might stop ministers, examine goods, imprison men; but these letters, like snow-flakes floating in the air on a winter's day, would drop upon all. These letters had crossed the Atlantic, and had begun to evangelize that land, whose inhabitants now called to American Methodists, as the company in New York called to John Wesley, 'Send us men.' 'Come over and help us.'" Again: "The Scandinavians came over to us. . . . We did not wish to go to Norway; we had no thought of it; but one of our converts went home full of love and fire, and without being sent by the missionary society, he told the story of the cross as soon as he landed; the people wept, some were converted, and the cry came, 'Send a missionary!' and now we have three there,* and they have raised up native helpers, and God has opened a door for a work, though to a limited degree." By the same home operation we have been led to Denmark and Sweden. Of these missions, established among the for-

* Increased since.

eign populations in our own country, the last annual report of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church says, referring particularly to the Swedish Mission in New York city: "It is the battery which sends back its evangelical shocks to Europe, to awaken a religious concern in old Scandinavia." Beautifully and powerfully said; and by cultivating American home interests faithfully and fully, the shocks of our evangelical battery will soon be sufficient to awaken the world!

We have an impressive illustration of the truth of this position in the contrast existing between Moravianism and Methodism. They commenced their career about the same time, with about equal original advantages and qualifications. Each clearly apprehending and embracing experimental and practical Christianity, both baptized with power from on high, they entered the great field, the world, for labor. *One hundred and twenty-five years ago* Moravianism entered the field of foreign missions. They went north to Greenland, and south to the West India Islands. In less than *nine years* they had missionaries in Greenland, St. Thomas, St. Croix, Surinam, Berbice, Lapland, Guiana, and Ceylon; at the Cape of Good Hope, in Africa, among the Indians in North America, and the Negroes of South Carolina. These were gigantic and praiseworthy efforts; but they consumed their strength and exhausted the fountain of life, and to-day the weight of Moravianism is scarcely felt in Christendom, and her power for doing good abroad is in the same proportion feeble. Methodism devoted itself to laying broad foundations in nominal Christian lands; the sanctification of civilization; to the cultivation and concentration of moral power; to spreading Scriptural holiness; and the consequence is, in her own organization she is the strongest element in the Christian world, which, in addition to the indirect influence exerted upon sister Churches by the diffusion and infusion of her own spirit of life, warrants the conclusion that Methodism, since her origin, has done and is doing more for the *conversion of the world than all influences beside*. And this she has done by working at home. Home work is the true system for evangelizing the world. Strength at home gives efficiency abroad. And our home in the hearts of the people depends on our attention to their interests. Behold the contrast between Moravianism and Methodism after the labors of one hundred and twenty-five years: the one upon the foreign, and the other upon the principle of home work! It is questionable whether, if Moravianism had done her work as effectually in Germany as Methodism did hers in England, neology would have swept over that country, subverting revealed religion, or that Methodism would be called upon to-day to spend

her means in spreading Gospel truth there. Nay, is it not probable that Germany would have been as powerful and influential in the cause of evangelism as England or America. If this be supposable how much more would have been done for the conversion of the world than now is?

If the home work is well done we need have no solicitude about the foreign; indeed, there will be no foreign. We repeat, the center of Christianity is everywhere. The minister of Christ cannot go abroad; the world is his field. "Going abroad" may be an allowable phrase with the pleasure-seeking tourist; but not for those who are seeking the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Doing our work well where we are, at the point we call home, will naturally and inevitably result in the enlargement of our borders. Especially must this be the case in a country like ours. God has determined the question for us. His providence, that mighty wheel that revolutionizes the affairs of man, and turns nations upside down, that turns the stream and tides of human life, as well as the waters of the south, has opened wide our gates, and cast into our lap the inhabitants of the world, saying as it does so, not, Take this child, but, Take these multitudes of the nations of the earth and bring them up for me. God has brought us a world's work in all its variety, if not extent, to our very doors. He has saved us the time and the money to go abroad to do his work. He has brought it to us. No other nation has been so honored in this respect. While Christian England is required to go abroad to the perishing and the heathen, the heathen and the perishing are brought to us. Germany is here; Norway is here; Sweden is here; Denmark is here; France is here; Ireland is here; Spain is here; Italy is here; Africa is here; China is here; the savage aborigines of our own country fill our wildernesses and darken the horizon of our civilized border. These are all here; here in vast multitudes; here, with all their ignorance and infidelity, with all their superstition and heathenism. The providence of God, in setting in this tide of immigration upon us, has filled our hands with work. By this he calls upon us to labor at home, and to labor at home for the conversion of the world abroad. And who can doubt that by laboring in obedience to this call, and in concert with this providential arrangement of work, that we must be more successful than in any other field, or under any other circumstances. We have these multitudes of the world's population here under the influence of our own political, social, and religious institutions, which we presume to say are more favorable for moral improvement than any in the world. Certainly, vastly more advantageous than are those in

the countries from whence they come. We may here bring them into immediate contact with the most vital, active, powerful type of Christianity anywhere to be found. And the class of material which Providence brings us to prepare, is the class, of all others, best adapted to become instrumentalities for moving the world when moved themselves. They are in sympathy with the masses at home; they are active and energetic. Thus we are placed in position for raising the best missionaries for Germany, France, Ireland, Sweden, Norway, Spain, Italy, Russia, Africa, and China. If we are to calculate human probabilities for doing good, they certainly greatly preponderate in favor of the home work. We are placed in a position to bring the greatest immediate amount of religious influence to bear upon these several countries. And to Christianize the nations so largely represented in America will be to Christianize all the active elements of society in the world, which, when done, the result is readily foreseen. It is the surest, speediest, and most reasonable method for *American Christians* to labor for the conversion of the world.

By this method that which is called foreign work will be prosecuted as extensively as it can be efficiently. Due attention to the principle here argued and illustrated, we doubt not, would increase both the number and efficiency of such missions. We would not have them less, we would not have them more, than can be well sustained and vigorously prosecuted. Curtailing missions and abandoning missions, the effect of which is so injurious to the spirit of the Church and upon the forsaken, would never result from this line of policy.

This has been the *leading* policy, thus far, of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Practical adherence thereto has led her into her most promising fields of enlargement and usefulness. Indeed, all her missions that have been successful have developed from this policy. In this manner our missions among the Indians were commenced, the most successful of any missions we have ever prosecuted among the heathen. In the same way Africa opened before us, for which benighted race we have done more than any other denomination of Christians. In accordance with the same general principle our mission in South America is sustained, which has proved itself to be one of our most profitable foreign appointments. Thus was our mission in Honolulu, Sandwich Islands, begun: "Some members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for purposes of business, settled at Honolulu, the capital of the Sandwich Islands, and asked to be still recognized as children of the Church, though thousands of miles distant from her sanctuaries."*

* Missionary Report, 1858.

In this way our foreign German and Scandinavian missions have opened before us, manifestly the leadings of God's providence,* all growing, naturally and directly, out of our home work; illustrating that it is the effectual method, for us at least, to reach the world, and that by faithfully performing this work it will lead us on as far and as fast as we are prepared to do the work of the Lord efficiently. Why will not the same process of home preparation which fitted and called us out among the Indians, and to Africa, and to Germany, and to Sweden, etc., if we continue faithful at home, call us in due time to Ireland, to France, to Spain, to Italy, to Russia, and to the ends of the earth, preparing here, and taking with us, the nucleus, the magnet of attraction, around which to gather the saved of the Lord. The policy we advocate is not a stay-at-home policy, but one by which we seek to spread our home blessings over the whole world. We advocate it because we think it is the most effectual for converting the world.

More especially is this plan of missionary work adapted to the Methodist Episcopal Church. It is in strict accordance with her original providential call and design, as understood and expressed by her wise and practical founder and his coadjutors. Methodism in its origin and original labors was distinct, entirely so, from all forms of *ecclesiasticism*, from all denominational or sectarian covenants and creeds. Under its various leaders in the Church, or out of the Church, it was simply Methodism. It was not Episcopacy, nor Independency, nor Connectionalism; it was not Whitefieldism nor Wesleyanism; it was Methodism. It was the angel of the Apocalypse flying through mid-heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach unto the *Churches*. It was the spirit of prophecy, prophesying in the midst of the valley of dry bones, accompanied by the influence of the Holy Ghost, and great was the effect; a living army was raised up, marshaling itself under various banners for battle. The original and providential mission of Methodism was to existing Churches, to nominal Christian communities, with emphatic distinctness. John Wesley so understood it. When he formed his societies he defined them to be "a company of men having the form and seeking the power of godliness, united in order to pray together, to receive the word of exhortation, and to watch over one another in love, that they may help each other to work out their salvation." The only condition of admission into these societies was "a desire to flee from the wrath to come and to be saved from their sins." The members of these societies were at liberty to hold

* We would direct special attention to that portion of the Missionary Report for 1858, under the head "The Providential Rise of our Missions." Pp. 19-25.

their connection, and commune with any Church they saw proper. The early masters of Methodism labored not for party, for power, or honor, but to do good, exhibiting in a remarkable manner the highest degree of moral heroism and entire self-abnegation.

This view of Methodism is the historical standpoint and principle of unity in Dr. Stevens's admirable and philosophical "History of Methodism." So thorough was Mr. Wesley's conviction of its anti-sectarian mission that he never departed in spirit or organization further from it than was absolutely necessary. "Wesley formed no creed for the English Methodists, and though some of his own writings are recognized in his chapel deeds and by the civil courts as the standard of Methodist doctrine, yet from their number, and the great variety of subjects treated in them, a rigorous system of interpretation has become impossible. In providing an organization for Methodism in the New World, where it was destined to have its chief range, he so abridged the Articles of the Church of England as to exclude the most formidable of modern theological controversies, and make it possible for Calvinists, alike with Arminians, to enter its communion; he prescribed no mode of baptism, but virtually recognized all modes; and it has been doubted, incautiously, perhaps, whether even a Restorationist or Universalist, if exemplary in life, could be adjudged a heretic by its creed.* Methodism reversed, in fine, the usual policy of religious sects, who seek to sustain their spiritual life by their orthodoxy; it has sustained its orthodoxy by devoting its chief care to its spiritual life. . . . It was, in fine, a system of vital doctrines and practical expedients, a breaking away from all old dead-weights which had encumbered the march of the Reformation, a revival Church in its spirit, a missionary Church in its organization."† In the address of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as found in the Discipline, p. iv, is this statement: "We believe that God's design in raising up the preachers called Methodists in America *was to reform the continent and to spread Scriptural holiness over these lands.*"

The application of this is, that the work which we are urging upon the Church is the very work for which Methodism was originally designed. We believe that the providential call of Methodism was rightly apprehended by Mr. Wesley, and hence the unparalleled success of his labors. The tenacity with which he adhered to this view was a wise tenacity. The effort to bring Methodism into direct contact with all the organized forms of Christianity, and baptize and bless all with its spirit of catho-

* One must believe in "the wrath to come" in order to "desire to flee from" it.

† History of Methodism, vol. i pp. 30-32.

licity and zeal, was an effort that would honor the highest type of Christian reformer. And we further believe, that just so far as circumstances will at all permit, there should still be close adherence to the primitive and providential design of Methodism. The original field should be occupied as far as possible. In it Methodism has been eminently successful. In no one instance has failure followed this adherence; success has trod upon the heels of success, glory has crowned glory in all such fields of labor. Should we not then pause before we depart from the original spirit and old paths of Methodism, and first do all the work for which God evidently raised us up. Home work, and work in Christian lands and in civilized communities, is eminently adapted to the original and providential design of Methodism. Methodism, in its original spirit and practice, was the highest type of Christian catholicity; and to prosecute its original mission still requires the highest degree of self-forgetfulness.

Again: Methodism in her providential organization (we say providential, for her organization has grown up under the formative influence of circumstances) is peculiarly fitted for this kind of work. On this point we will quote from an article in this Review, in 1847, written by Dr. Olin, entitled "Missions and Methodism." He says:

"Methodism has been diffused throughout this country rather by the aggressive genius and inherent tendencies of the system, than by any extraordinary and special exertions. An *itinerant* by the established economy of his Church, the Methodist minister ever wears the panoply of a missionary, and enters upon the missionary function at the call of duty with less inconvenience, and with habits more favorable to success, than could the settled pastor, more averse as he must be to change, and with less power of adaptation to the new and trying circumstances that beset this enterprise. We speak here of the special fitness of the itinerant system to meet the religious wants of a great country like ours, under the peculiar and ever-varying conditions that result from our position, our institutions, and the character of our people; from the vast extent and fertility of the fresh regions that tempt our adventurous families to seek their fortunes in the wilderness, and that give birth to new states, and territories, and populous towns in such rapid succession; from the absence of religious establishments and endowments, and the consequent liberty conferred, and obligations imposed, upon every Christian sect to consider 'the world as its parish,' and 'to do good to all men as it has opportunity;' from immigration and from emigration, which are constantly infusing new elements and tendencies into society, and impressing new characteristics upon our already heterogeneous population; and we are satisfied that all intelligent Christians, who recognize it as a branch of Christ's Church on earth, will also recognize in American Methodism *special and providential adaptations* to the great field in which it has been called to fulfill its mission." P. 277.

This organization, so admirably adapted to our country and similar fields, is not adapted to heathen lands; and having been so successfully worked by Methodism, and with such a vast field still for its exercise, and a system peculiarly our own, not adopted by any other Church, for reaching the scattered, the borderers, and the

stranger, we should hesitate to turn away from such a field, to cultivate which we are organically designed.

We would earnestly urge *home* upon the attention of the Methodist Episcopal Church, also, from the fact that all the other leading denominations of the country are already largely committed to the foreign work, and so committed that they cannot draw back. Their work will increase, and not decrease. Their resources will be required to meet these increasing demands. Home is in danger of being neglected. This is apparent from a survey of its extent and a consideration of its rapid growth. As a Church we are not as yet so deeply involved abroad as to cripple our operations at home. As a Church we love the home work. We make liberal provision for it. We are accomplishing a vast amount of it. It was the leading design of our fathers in the formation of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church. "The Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church is established for the express purpose of enabling the several annual conferences more effectually to extend their missionary labors throughout the United States and elsewhere, and also to assist in the support and promotion of missionary schools and missions in our own and in foreign countries."*

We are just now in danger of losing sight of this Methodistic land-mark; in danger of departing from the "express purpose" of our Missionary Society, which was, and is, so entirely in harmony with the genius, organization, and success of Methodism. Let us pause here. There is no part of the world that has claims so strong upon us as home; no part of the world where there is such a variety of work to be done; nowhere are the fields so white unto the harvest; no point from whence so great an influence can be exerted upon the whole world for good. We are providentially adapted to this work. No other Church has the same facilities for doing it. No other Church is as free from foreign engagements as ourselves. Let us then pause, and reconsider our relations to the great question. Not for idleness, or ease, but to engage in labors more abundant, and, we certainly think, (mistaken we may be,) *more important and effectual for the salvation of the world.* Denominational pride would urge us abroad. A seeming equality in zeal and position with sister Churches may demand it. But let us consent to forego this honorable distinction for the more humble work of home missions; enlarging our borders as we have hitherto done, until the call to the outposts shall be as providentially manifested as it now is to remain at home, or until the circling wave of our influence shall break upon the remotest shore.

* Constitution of Missionary Society of the M. E. Church, Art. I.

There is another argument in favor of the home field that must not be overlooked, nor decided as mercenary when presented. It is the *financial argument*. Financial economy is a Christian duty. Business ability in conducting the great benevolent enterprises of the Church is a requisite increasingly important. These institutions have grown into great moneyed corporations, and practical business talent, rigidly applying business principles, is absolutely necessary in their management. The period, if not already gone, is fast fading away, when these institutions can be safely left in the hands of a few ministers of the Gospel, untrained to business, nay, by their calling positively unfitted for it, with the exception of a few rare cases; and these ministers, too, only able to give a few fragments of their time to the work. To be managed well, they must have the care of the mind accustomed to calculate financial chances and changes, to husband resources, stop financial leakages, and apply means in accordance with sanctified worldly wisdom, where and when there are the greatest probabilities of accomplishing most for the object contemplated. It is well known that no interests are so loosely managed as corporate interests. Political corporations are said to have no souls. Public moneys are for public pillage. We do not intend to say that this soulless recklessness characterizes our benevolent institutions; but we do intend to say that these interests are seldom managed as closely as private interests are. There is great danger of their benevolence degenerating into prodigality, by permitting matters to pass without a careful financial scrutiny. That we are not over-cautious in this connection, nor exciting unjustifiable suspicions, is evident from a public statement recently made, that in one of our great missionary associations it cost over *fifty per cent.* to collect and distribute the funds!

We are glad to bear testimony to the economical administration of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church. It costs this society for conducting its entire business only about *two per cent.* We will venture to say there is not another benevolent institution so economically administered in the United States. The point of economy, then, is an important one, and we need it not only in its application to the business details of such societies, but also in the selection of *missionary fields and the appropriations to the work.*

It must not be argued that "missions are missions;" that "the field is the world," and that it matters not where we work, so that we do not go out of the world to preach to the spirits beneath. It does make a difference. Each has a limited amount of his Lord's money to appropriate, and can bring certain forces only into the work, and it becomes therefore a high moral and religious obliga-

tion, to select wisely, husband resources economically, and so dispose of men and means as to accomplish the greatest amount of good.

We have already remarked that the administration of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church is more economical than that of any other benevolent institution known to us; to which we now add, that it has accomplished more for the salvation of the world, with the same amount of means, than any other organization of the kind; and there is no doubt that one principal cause of its great economy and accomplishments is found in its chosen home field of labor. Foreign heathen fields are very expensive to cultivate, and the gathered and garnered sheaves are few and far between. We would not enter upon a calculation of the cost of saving souls per head, yet, if we have only so many thousand dollars to expend on the work, it becomes a question of duty whether we shall spend them where the almost certain result will be thousands of souls saved, or spend them in laying foundations upon which we hope to rear a spiritual temple in the future, at best by a very slow process. Would not practical economy and Christian wisdom both dictate, do the work which we are now prepared to do, and by which hundreds and thousands of souls will be immediately saved? Does not this course of action seem to be very much in accordance with the spirit and provisions of the Gospel? Its provisions are for present application, its salvation is for the present generation of men: "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation." Should not the great work of saving souls be prosecuted for present results? Is not one soul saved on American soil as valuable as one saved "on India's coral strand?" And another appropriate consideration in this connection is expressed in the quotation already made from the Rev. Mr. Waddy: "the certainty that all Christian labor expended upon them [that is, inhabitants of England] will permanently bear fruit of men and money for missionary work, stamps all advances toward the conversion of England with a world-wide value." Relatively, a soul converted on English or American soil is more valuable for the conversion of the world, than the conversion of the Krooman or the Hottentot, the Brahmin or Mandarin. Financial economy and "world-wide" spiritual results are combined in the home work.

This argument is appreciable by the people. How often do we hear from them objections to sending money and men abroad, founded upon the great outlay and the small results. They say it is unwise, a prodigal expenditure, a waste of means; that the same amount of money and effort expended at home, in and around one

of our large cities, would return thirty, sixty, or a hundred fold for this world and for the world to come. And wherewith shall we answer them? We must not reply, This is a mere excuse for keeping the purse-strings tied. It is not so. Many of our wiser and more liberal Christian men thus reason. They are as deeply interested in the salvation of the world as those who go to the uttermost parts of the earth to promote it. But they are practical rather than poetical men. The missionary work thus calculated on business principles, economically considered, accomplishing the greatest amount of good with a given amount of means, demands home effort. If this matter were submitted to uncommitted Christian business men, such would be their decision.

To test fairly the views of the Church and of the country on this question, we should have a Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church; a separate, independent organization. The foreign and home work should be definitely presented, and their claims separately urged: not as rival organizations, but on their own distinct merits. These are broad enough to furnish a platform for each, and will command preferences sufficiently decided to sustain both. There are some who will give only for foreign missions; there are others who will give only to home missions; while there are many who would give much more than they now do, if the interests were divided. Both would be benefited.

Many objections would be obviated by a separation. The exclusive friends of the foreign work, who accuse our Missionary Society of unfairness, to say the least, in raising funds by pleas for the "perishing heathen," and then expending them in the cities of the East, or on the prairies in the West, would have the occasion of the accusation removed. And those who are constantly saying to us, "Why do you not organize a Home Missionary Society? we will give liberally to such a society; we are deeply interested in the welfare of our own land; we believe it to be our first duty to supply it with the Gospel;" we could then furnish such with an opportunity for the fullest exercise of their Christian benevolence and patriotism. All grounds for these various objections and excuses would be taken away, and men would be shut up to the necessity of giving, or of acknowledging that they had no interest in the salvation of others. The present arrangement cannot be satisfactory to the man keenly alive to one interest only; in vain we affirm that the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church cares for both. This is the very thing he objects to. He does not wish his funds divided. In his estimation any division would be disproportionate; either too much, or too little, would be given to the home, or foreign

work, as the judgment and sympathies of the donor were enlisted. This combination of interests makes it quite an impossibility for the "General Missionary Committee" to give satisfaction in their appropriations.

That there is a demand in the Methodist Episcopal Church in favor of the home work, that is not met by our General Missionary Society, is evinced by our numerous missionary societies for local purposes. Our City Missionary Societies, Ladies' Missionary Societies, and Young Men's Missionary Societies, altogether independent in their organizations, are constantly increasing. And these exist and multiply because of the demand by the Church for *larger appropriations for the home work than can be secured through our present Missionary Society.* Would it not be wise Methodist policy to yield to this demand, and form some scheme for concert of action, rather than risk these isolated societies?

This demand, has been recognized in our Disciplinary provisions for the "Support of Missions."

"Any annual conference may, at its option, by a vote of two-thirds of its members, assume the responsibility of supporting such missions, already established within its own limits, as have hitherto been reported under the head of 'Missions in the destitute portions of the regular work,' and for this purpose it shall be at liberty to organize a Conference Domestic Society with branches, *provided* such organization shall not interfere with the collections for the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as required by the Discipline. *Provided, also,* that in case more funds shall be raised for such missions than are needed, the surplus shall be paid over to the treasurer of the Parent Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at New York, to be appropriated to such mission or missions, under the care of the society, as may be designated by said conference."—*Discipline*, p. 198.

Under this provision domestic missionary societies may be formed in every annual conference, with branches or auxiliaries throughout their limits, for the support and enlargement, it is presumed, of the "destitute portions of the regular work." Here a beginning could be made. A Connectional Conference Home Missionary Society could be formed, and these conference societies could be combined and represented in a general organization for the whole Church. Thus our entire home field could be brought under the direct supervision of those most interested and best acquainted with its wants, each auxiliary reporting to its conference, and each conference to the General Board. And such an organization, in its details, could be made to meet all the necessities now calling for local societies. Indeed, it would be composed of local societies, under general government, which should have their own Board of Management, and the control of their own funds, with certain limitations for general purposes.

Why not organize such conference societies? They are disciplinary, practical, and demanded. The complaint of annual conferences is almost universal, that the appropriations for conference purposes are entirely too small.

To do our work well in the several annual conferences, we must have more money in some way, more missionary money, directly or indirectly. It occurs to us, that conference organizations are the surest and most Methodistic way of securing the object. And those who are more immediately interested in the foreign work say they have no apprehension that such a movement would diminish the receipts for that department of labor. Let us then have a home missionary organization for the Methodist Episcopal Church.

In this connection we are tempted to a speculation on the subject of specific missionary societies, distinct from the organization of the Church with which they are associated. The true, visible Church of Christ is a missionary society, a divinely-constituted missionary society, and the only divinely-constituted missionary society; missionary work is inseparably interwoven with her organic existence. It is the paramount object of organization at all. Is it, then, the more excellent way to organize societies to do the work of the Church, the special work to which she is divinely called? Whether we have not by these organizations marred the close, life-circulating relations which should always exist between the missionary work and the Church of Christ? Would we not more effectually serve our object of advancing the kingdom of Christ in the world, by teaching, and impressing upon every local Church organization the great truth, that it was raised up, and blessed with Gospel privileges and spiritual power, for the very purpose of extending them to others? Should not every Church, not by the formation of a separate society, not by formal voluntary resolution, but by Divine appointment, be considered, and, in the name of the great Head of the Church, baptized, *Missionary Society*! By such teaching we would more effectually bind the missionary work upon the heart and conscience of the Church. This idea, we think, is expressed on page 194 of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church: "The support of missions is committed to the churches, congregations, and societies, *as such*." Yet, for the present, special missionary organizations seem to be a necessity.

But to return from this speculation. If the arguments here adduced will not secure the adoption of the policy presented; if, as a Church, we must go abroad, jumping over wide wastes to get far off; if this must be so, let us, as the next best thing, consider, as a Church, our peculiarities, and select our fields and method of labor

in view of them. Individuals have their personal qualifications, fitting them for certain positions and duties; so have individual Churches their *esprit du corps* and their peculiarities, fitting them for certain fields and modes of labor in the vineyard of the Lord.

We have delineated briefly what we consider the peculiarities of Methodism in spirit, call, and organic adaptation, and have designated what we suppose to be her appropriate work in the great enterprise of saving the world. She is peculiarly adapted to civilized communities, to nominally Christian lands, to raise fallen and infuse life into dead Churches. If, then, we must go abroad, let us select fields presenting these features. Our German, Scandinavian, and Bulgarian missions are eminently of this character, and we may multiply such to any extent. All Europe is open to us, presenting fields of this description; the great empire of Russia, all South America and Mexico; in the Lutheran Church, the Greek Church, and the Romish Church; among the mountain Nestorians of Persia, and the Armenians of Asia Minor. Here are ample fields for work for which we are peculiarly fitted, and we need only to adhere to our original spirit and method of labor to accomplish a great portion of it.

More than fifty years ago the Rev. Melville Horne, successor of the saintly Fletcher at Madeley, and who at one time traveled with Mr. Wesley, in a series of spirit-stirring letters on missions, apprehends very clearly this point in connection with Methodism. In contrasting it with Moravianism, he says:

"The zeal of the Methodist blazes and burns everything before it. He is open, active, bold, and ardent. He sees himself in a pushing world, and pushes with the foremost. . . . He mixes in the world, makes a hundred attempts to effect his purpose, and if baffled in them all, directs his labors to some other quarter which affords full scope to his activity. He lives in action, and is dejected and uncomfortable if he wants active employment. The Methodists are known chiefly for what they have done at home. . . . Itinerancy is the palladium of Methodism. Fixing upon some favorable post they revolve in a circle around it, perpetually making excursions in the neighboring country, and multiplying their circuits and their preachers in proportion to their success. If they do not split of themselves there is hardly anything in the missionary line which they may not attempt and succeed in. But they will not, I fear, be able to steer clear of persecution, as the Moravians have done, nor do I conceive they have patience and perseverance for a Greenland mission. A Methodist preacher would think his life thrown away, in spending twenty or thirty years upon a few converts, and I flatter myself that Methodists are too well acquainted with themselves to engage in such undertakings, while so many large and populous kingdoms are accessible to them.—Letter III.

The method by which we should work these fields is worth a thought, whether by independent Church organizations, or in accordance with our primitive method. Asking no recognition as a Church where the people are already churchd, and sufficiently

orthodox for salvation; disclaiming all sectarianism; going forth into the highways and hedges only to do good; breathing life into dead orthodoxy, writing salvation upon the walls and praise upon the gates of existing Church establishments. The result proves this to have been a wise course in England. And would it not now, under similar circumstances, reach and conciliate certain pastors, and open doors of access to the people for greater usefulness than could be secured in any other way? Could it not have been done in Germany, in Norway, and in Stockholm, years ago? Could it not be done in Bulgaria? Are there not always a few pastors in these national and ancient Churches who, by proper approach, would welcome such co-operation? May we not diffuse Gospel salvation throughout Germany more successfully by this method than by independent Church organization? Our missionaries have been persecuted, fined, and imprisoned in Germany, for violations of national Church laws; and only in the city of Bremen are we permitted to exist as an organized Church. Has not our choice of this method very much circumscribed our influence? There were national causes at work in Germany before we sent any missionary there, stirring to spiritual life and regeneration. Here and there the national pulpit gave out a certain sound. The spark was beginning to glow. Now might not Methodism have blown the spark of Holy Ghost religion into a flame, if our ministers had offered themselves as helpers, evangelists, and revivalists to the spiritual part of the established clergy, and might it not be to Germany what it was to England in the days of Wesley? In accordance with this view, one of our missionaries, (Brother Nippert,) in a recent letter, gives an account of a hearty welcome into the parish of the Rev. Mr. Kuntze, of Berlin, authorizing him to *form classes*, and labor in his own way for the salvation of the people. Are there not more such welcomes awaiting us? Is it too late to accept of them?

These are speculations and queries only, thrown out to call attention to a point of practicability in prosecuting our mission work. It is true this course might not reflect so much denominational glory, but our glory should be to do the greatest amount of good; and if it can be accomplished by this co-operation with established Churches, let us not falter in following in the footsteps of our founder.

Before closing this our last article on missions, we wish to notice briefly the comparison so frequently made between the contributions of the Methodist Episcopal Church for missions and other benevolent objects with those of other Churches, particularly with the English Wesleyans. These comparisons are instituted so frequently upon the platform, in the pulpit, and through the press, by our own

writers and speakers, to our great disparagement as a Church, that humble acquiescence in their truth seems to have become a virtue.

We believe that in this matter downright injustice is done us. In an article in the "*National Magazine*," November, 1858, p. 410, entitled "*British and American Methodism compared*," we find the following statement: "That British Methodism raises for missions one dollar and forty-two cents per member annually, while we (in the Methodist Episcopal Church) raise for the same object but twenty-eight cents per member annually! The American Church has more abundant means, and about double the membership, and ought, in all fairness, to outstrip the parent Church in the amount of her contributions."

Comparisons certainly are odious sometimes, and one hundred and forty-two against twenty-eight, five to one, is sufficient to make the Methodist Episcopal Church so, if it be a fair comparison. Yet, to make it still darker, it is affirmed that the Methodist Episcopal Church "has more abundant means" and about double the membership." It is true we have a much larger membership than they, but this has nothing to do with the point of the comparison. It may be true also that our aggregate wealth as a Church is greater than theirs, and it is also true that our wealth is more generally distributed, and we have more comfortable homes among us than they have, for which we are unfeignedly thankful. But even this does not determine that we have more for benevolent purposes than they have. The wealth of England is in a few hands. In the Church as well as in the world there are instances of overgrown wealth. Hence the large sums contributed by individuals to the various Wesleyan funds, which swell the aggregate so greatly. Ten thousand a year in the hands of one man ought to furnish a much larger proportion for benevolent contributions than if it were equally distributed among ten persons. Now comparatively, we presume, the Wesleys have more persons of the greater ability than the American Church has. It does not require much arithmetical skill to discover that such a state of facts would greatly increase the ability to make a larger average contribution.

Again, to confine the comparison to missionary contributions only is unfair; it is to present a very contracted view of the subject; missionary money, as technically understood, is not the measure of a Church's labors or liberality. In this comparison home Church expenses must be taken into the account. Ours are much greater than theirs on an average of membership, thus diminishing our means for foreign contributions. Our population is sparse, expensive to reach; we are all the time beginning; everything is new;

they have finished; they are the sons, and have inherited from the fathers churches and parsonages. We are the fathers, the first generation, and are constantly making provision for the present, and can scarcely keep up with it.

Little more than *three fourths* of a century ago American Methodism in this wilderness had ten preachers and eleven hundred and sixty members; Wesleyan Methodism, at the same date, had one hundred and thirty ministers, thirty thousand members, and the experience of a whole generation: *thirteen times as many ministers*, and almost *thirty times as many members*, all the experience, and a cultivated populous country. Now with such unequal beginnings, and all the difficulties of a new country to contend with, border wars and English aggressive wars, with all we shrink not from a fair comparison. In that time American Methodism has conquered and cultivated, spiritually, more territory than England governs, notwithstanding the sun never sets upon her possessions. The cost of carrying on, to its present state of completeness, such a work, would more than reverse the ratio of one hundred and forty-two to twenty-eight! In this time American Methodism has grown from eleven hundred and sixty members to one million one hundred and seventy-nine thousand five hundred and twenty-six, and built thirteen thousand three hundred and thirty-eight churches. Wesleyanism grew in populous England from thirty thousand to about five hundred thousand members, "and has six thousand six hundred and forty-nine *places of worship*!" There is some room for comparison here.

But let us take the figures of "G. R. H.," as found in the "National" referred to. He says, In 1857 the Methodist Episcopal Church (North) had eight hundred and twenty thousand five hundred and nineteen members, and six thousand one hundred and thirty-four ministers, giving one minister to be supported by about every one hundred and thirty-six members; while in 1846 the British Connection had about fifteen hundred ministers and four hundred and sixty thousand members, giving one minister to be supported by every three hundred and six members; not half the home burden in the single item of ministerial support that the Methodist Episcopal Church has, and yet we are compared disparagingly in our missionary contributions! Why not institute a comparison on this point?

The peculiar statement of "G. R. H." in regard to the houses of worship excites our curiosity. He says British Methodism "has six thousand six hundred and forty-nine *places of worship*." The Methodist Episcopal Church numbers eight thousand three hundred

and thirty-five *church edifices*." What is meant by using "places of worship" in the one case, and "church edifices" in the other? We know what the latter means, but does the former mean the same thing? It is a pity that the writer in the "National," in correcting the worthy president of the Ohio University, had not been a little more definite in his statements. We do not believe that the British Methodists have six thousand six hundred and forty-nine "church edifices," or Wesleyan chapels, or "G. R. H." would have said so. Dr. Thomson says they have in England about three hundred! Nor are the eight thousand three hundred and thirty-five church edifices all the "places of worship" occupied by the Methodist Episcopal Church. If all such places are included the number will at least be doubled. Are we to understand, then, that eight hundred and twenty thousand five hundred and nineteen members of the Methodist Episcopal Church have built eight thousand three hundred and thirty-five church edifices in the last *three quarters* of a century, and that five hundred thousand Wesleyans have built three hundred Wesleyan chapels in the same time? According to these figures, every English congregation of about fifteen hundred has built a chapel, while every American congregation of about one hundred has done the same! And yet our missionary contributions are compared with theirs to exhibit our meanness!

And further, all the missionary money of the Wesleyans, even to the children's Christmas offerings, is reported in the great aggregate. The report of the treasurer of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church does not include, by a large amount, all that is contributed for missionary purposes by the Church. There are many other considerations to be taken into the account, in order to do justice to American Methodism, which we may not introduce here. Take our great publishing interest sustained by the Church. The American Church is publishing as much annually as the Wesleyans have for the last generation. We confess we have been provoked by these offensive and sophistical comparisons.

The truth is, while American Methodism gives all honor to her Wesleyan mother, she has far outstripped her in labor for the salvation of the world. The difference in growth indicates more accurately the difference in doing good than the amount per head of missionary contributions. In this country "its rate of increase has been *twenty-fold*, while in England its increase has been *seven-fold*."

With equal sincerity we offer the prayer for both branches of the great Methodist family: May "the Lord God of *our* fathers make *us* a thousand times so many more as *we* are, and bless *us*, as he has promised *us*."

ART. IX.—THE WILL OF GOD.

THE progress of true theology depends very much upon a growing precision of ideas in relation to the import of Biblical terms. Theological systems have a constant tendency to warp the legitimate sense of words as dictated by the Holy Spirit, and to make them speak the language of particular oracles, symbols, schools, or sects. It is for this reason that exegesis becomes so important as a final appeal, even when didactics and polemics have long given law to opinion. The Grammar, the Lexicon, and the Concordance will ever be the most weighty witnesses summoned to the stand, when a verdict is to be passed on any asserted tenet of Holy Writ. No matter how excellent a translation, it can never replace or supersede the inspired originals. No matter how long a specific doctrine may have enthroned itself in the Church, it can never plead a prescription so sacred as to exempt it from the inquest of a sound philology. No degree of metaphysical subtilty, of bold hypothesis, or ingenious speculation, can pass unchallenged by the linguistic sentinels which keep guard on the outposts of the theological domain. Sentiments that have become enshrined in the sanctity of familiar aphorisms and adages, and which are seldom thought of being questioned, are liable, like more dubious positions, to be brought to the ordeal which nothing bearing the impress of revealed truth can hope finally to escape.

The phrase, "will of God," standing at the head of the present article, would probably suggest to the casual reader as little involving matter of debate as any three words that could be conveniently framed together, yet they are not beyond the reach of a stern interrogation on the score of their genuine Scriptural significance, and we shall be somewhat mistaken if the sequel do not evince that a very marked modification must come over our conceptions of the phrase before it conveys to us the precise sense of the original. This we propose to endeavor to determine by a large induction of instances displaying the ruling *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers as concerns the phrase in question, and deducing from the whole a train of inferences bearing upon some of the most important teachings of Christianity.

That the object we propose to ourselves may be as clearly defined as possible in the outset, we remark that the term *will*, in the present connection, stands in most minds as synonymous with *purpose*, *resolve*, *fixed decree*, etc., denoting certain results that the Divine

wisdom designs to have accomplished, whether in the field of physical or moral action. The mass of readers, when they meet with the phrase, are probably conscious of no special ambiguity in it, and think of the "will of God," in its degree, somewhat as they do of the will of Napoleon, of the will of the Russian Czar, of the will of a Parliament, of a Congress, or any other legislative body. The substantive *will* carries with it, quite invariably in this connection, at least in the mind's estimate, the latent epithet *decretory*, denoting a certain *absoluteness of purpose* which it is our object to eliminate from the genuine import of the word as applied to the will of Jehovah. A subtler analysis marks the processes of didactic theology, and hence it would be easy to cite a long list of scholastic distinctions which divines have thought indispensable to a correct apprehension of the subject. Of these the most important by far is the distinction of the *secret* and the *revealed* will of God, of which the former is supposed to be the rule of his own action, and the latter of ours. The justice of this distinction we shall have occasion to consider at length ere long; let it suffice at present to remark, that the phrase, "will of God," in common parlance, conveys no very clear or emphatic idea of *emotion* or *affection* in the Divine mind, but either that of simple *arbitrium*, or *determinate purpose*; whereas *will*, in the sense of *voluntas*, points to the *affectional state* of the willer, and identifies the will with the love. Our English language suffers from the lack of that nice discrimination in regard to this class of words which distinguishes the Latin. There we have *voluntas*, *volitio*, *arbitrium*, defining distinct shades of mental status or action; while our *will*, *choice*, *volition*, etc., come far short of that accuracy of import which the exigencies of sound reasoning require.

In the exhibit which we propose to make of the Scriptural usage of the term, we assume as a postulate the reality of the all important distinction between the *intellectual* and *moral* departments of our own nature and of the Divine nature. We would have no one startled at the idea that there is a divine as well as a human psychology; for we could never conceive how we were made after the image and likeness of God, if we could not look upon the main constitution of God's being as the archetype of ours. If we have intellect, love, and volition as distinguishing properties of our own nature, why should we not recognize these as essential attributes of the Divine nature also? The assignment of the will to the *moral* or *emotional* province of our being, instead of the *intellectual*, or instead of making it a distinct faculty by itself, may not appear, at the first glance, of so much importance as our results may prove it to be. We trust at least to show that by making *will*, when predicated of the

Most High, identical with *voluntas* instead of *arbitrium*, and resolving it into a *prevailing state of affection, a ruling velleity*, we exhibit it under a very different aspect from that in which it is ordinarily contemplated. But of this the reader will judge. In the conduct of the argument we make no apology for the free array of Greek and Hebrew type, as our object cannot be otherwise attained.

To the classical scholar the fact is familiar that the leading term in Greek used to denote the act of *willing* is $\theta\epsilon\lambda\omega$, of which another form, governing the formation of some of the tenses of $\theta\epsilon\lambda\omega$, is $\epsilon\theta\epsilon\lambda\omega$, *ethelo*. The rendering given of the verb is *to will, to be willing, to be pleased to do anything, to wish, to desire, to choose, to delight in, to have pleasure in, to love*. The dominant idea is that of *complacency*. The emotion indicated by the term may sometimes be heightened to *purpose* or *resolve*, but for the most part a strong *affectional propension* toward an object is the prominent import of the word. A few illustrative examples will here be in place.

Matthew i, 19: "Then Joseph . . . *not willing* ($\mu\eta\ \theta\epsilon\lambda\omega\nu$) to make her a public example." Not disposed.

Matthew viii, 2: "If thou *wilt* ($\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$) thou canst make me clean." If thou art *pleased* to do it.

Matthew xii, 7: "*I will have* ($\theta\epsilon\lambda\omega$) *mercy, and not sacrifice.*" I have *delight* or *complacency* in mercy.

Matthew xv, 32: "*I will not* ($\sigma\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\lambda\omega$) *send them away fasting.*" Here, as in hundreds of other cases in our version, the mere English reader could not determine whether the word "will" were simply a sign of the future tense, or indicated by a separate verb. The latter is the fact, and the import is clear of a peculiar state of *feeling* in the Saviour's breast, making him averse to sending away the multitude in a fasting condition. Indeed, in the former clause he says, "I have compassion on the multitude," etc.

Mark xii, 38: "Beware of the scribes, which *love* ($\theta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$) to go in long clothing."

Luke v, 39: "No man having drunk old wine straightway *desireth* ($\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$) new."

1 Corinthians xv, 3: "But God giveth it a body as *it hath pleased* him, ($\eta\theta\epsilon\lambda\eta\sigma\epsilon$.)"

2 Peter iii, 5: "For this they are *willingly* ($\theta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$) ignorant of."

Nothing can be plainer than that the verb *to will* in these cases carries with it a predominantly *affectional* import, and we have found no instance, either in the Old Testament or the New, where it seemed necessary to depart from this meaning. The affirmative

sense is invariably that of *predilection*, and the negative that of *aversion*; in either case the main idea being that of *emotion*.

The corresponding derivative noun *θελημα*, *thelema*, *will*, has, as might be expected, an analogous import, in which the sense of *willingness*, *disposedness*, rather than of *purpose* or *decree*, is the preponderant element. But this we propose to confirm by the display of the usage.

Matthew vi, 10: "Thy *will* (*θελημα*) be done in earth as in heaven." Thy *good pleasure*, or that which is *well pleasing* to thee.

Matthew xviii, 14: "It is not the *will* (*θελημα*) of your Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish." It is not a matter of *willingness* or *good pleasure* with him.

Matthew xxvi, 42: "If this cup may not pass away from me except I drink it, thy *will* (*θελημα*) be done." Let that which is the object of thy *complacency*, all things considered, take place.

Luke xii, 47: "And that servant which knew his Lord's *will*, (*θελημα*), and prepared not himself, neither did *according to his will*, (*προς το θελημα αυτου*), shall be beaten," etc. Did not act *toward his inclination*, or in accordance with it.

Luke xxiii, 25: "But he (Pilate) delivered Jesus to their *will*, (*θελημα*)." Gave him up to the *ruling disposition* of their hearts.

John iv, 34: "My meat is to do the *will* (*θελημα*) of him that sent me." To act in accordance with the *divine pleasure*.

Acts xiii, 22: "A man after mine own heart, which shall fulfill all my *will*, (*θεληματα*)." Literally, *shall do all my willings or volitions*; all that in which I take *complacency*.

Ephesians i, 5: "According to the good pleasure of his *will*, (*θελημα*)." Here the introduction of a closely related word, *ευδοκια*, *good pleasure*, having a manifest relation to the *affections*, confirms still more strongly our leading position in regard to the genuine import of *will*.

Ephesians i, 11: "According to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the *counsel of his own will*, (*κατα την βουλην του θεληματος αυτου*)." A case similar to that of the preceding verse; the word *βουλη* being used to indicate the *divine purpose* or *determination* accompanying the *affectional promptings* of the will.

Ephesians ii, 3: "Fulfilling the *desires* (*θεληματα*, *the willings*) of the flesh and the mind."

Thessalonians iv, 3: "This is the *will* (*θελημα*) of God, (even) your sanctification." The object of his *earnest desire*.

Revelations iv, 11: "Thou hast created all things, and for thy *pleasure* (*θελημα*, *thy will*) they are and were created."

It would be easy to multiply, *ad libitum*, equivalent examples from

the New Testament, all going to evince the soundness of our general position relative to the import of the phrase in question; but as this usage is Hellenic, and refers itself back to the diction of the Septuagint, we proceed to confirm our statement by evidence drawn from this latter source. Our concern here is indeed mainly with the substantive *θελημα*, *will*, and its Hebrew equivalents; but it is well worthy of remark, that in thirty-one cases out of about seventy-five, the Greek *θελω*, *to will*, is the rendering of the Hebrew *אבה*, *to love*. The following are among the instances.

Genesis xxiv, 8: "And if the woman will not be *willing* (תאבה, *θελη*) to follow thee," etc.

Deuteronomy i, 26: "Notwithstanding *ye would* (אביהם, *ηθελησατε*) not go up."

Isaiah i, 19: "If ye be *willing* (תאבה, *θελητε*) and obedient."

Ezekiel iii, 7: "The house of Israel *will* (יאבה, *θελησουσι*) not hearken unto thee; for they *will* (אבהם, *εθελησαν*) not hearken unto me."

In all these cases the literal import of the Hebrew is *to love*, which of course becomes so far a definition of the Greek *θελω*, *to will*. The substantive *θελημα* stands in the LXX. as a representative for the most part of two Hebrew words, *חפץ*, *hâphatz*, and *רצון*, *râtzon*, of which the English version is variously *will*, *desire*, *favor*, *acceptance* or *acceptable*, *pleasure*, *good pleasure*, *delight*, etc., as will appear from the ensuing array of texts.

In regard to the first of these words, (*חפץ*), Chamier remarks that, "Even the tyro in Hebrew is aware that the root signifies not simply *to will*, but *to will with affectionate earnestness*, so that it properly denotes *beneplacitum*, or that which is *well pleasing*, as Ezekiel xviii, 32: 'For *I have no pleasure* (לֹא אֶחְפֵּץ) in the death of him that dieth.'" In like manner, Gerhard (in Peter) says: "It signifies more than simply *willing*, namely, *to will with desire, complacency, and delight*, as Genesis xxxiv, 19; Psalms cxlvii, 10; Isaiah lxii, 4. So as to the other term (*רצון* from *רצה*) the lexicographer Leigh observes that the verb denotes a *willing with a peculiar vehemency and delight*. "The use of the term is frequent in reference to the acceptableness of sacrifices, offerings, and prayers made to the Most High, as Job xxxiii, 26; Psalm li, 21; cxix, 122; Malachi i, 8; Leviticus xix, 7; xxii, 25. It properly signifies *to regard as agreeable, to receive with acceptance, to treat with benevolence, to will with good pleasure, to take delight in anything*. For this reason the Greek interpreters have occasionally rendered it by *ευδοκεω*, *to be well or benevolently affected toward any one*. In Psalm lxxxv, 2; Leviticus xxvi, 41, the word denotes *to accept with pleasure*

and good-will." Leigh further remarks of the noun רצון, "that it implies favorable acceptance or good-will, gracious liking or acceptance, being derived from a word which, according to the apostle, Hebrew xii, 6, from Proverbs iii, 12, signifies to accept, and also to be well pleased or delighted. Matthew xii, 18, from Isaiah xlii, 1. It is also interpreted will or pleasure. Hebrew x, 7, from Proverbs iii, 12. (See Willett on Leviticus xxii, 19.)" To this he adds the following from Graser on Daniel (Exercit. 2): "The word רצון properly signifies that affection of mind into which one is drawn with a spontaneous impulse, and in which he rests acquiescingly and with delight. Its import in the sacred writings is principally conspicuous in designating that ardent affection of love and benevolence with which the Divine Father embraces his only begotten Son and us in him." But an exhibition of the actual Scripture usage in regard to these words will be still more satisfactory. Let not the reader forget that these are the terms employed for the most part to denote the *divine will* as that is spoken of in the Old Testament.

1 Kings x, 9: "Blessed be the Lord thy God which *delighted* (רצו, ευδοκησε) in thee, to set thee on the throne of Israel."

Psalm xxii, 8: "He trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him; let him deliver him, seeing that he *delighted* in him, (רצו.)"

2 Samuel xv, 25: "But if he (the Lord) thus say, *I have no delight* in thee, (לא רצו.)"

Isaiah xlii, 21: "The Lord is *well pleased* (רצו) for his righteousness' sake."

Isaiah xlvi, 10: "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my *pleasure*, (רצו.)"

In addition to the examples given a page or two below, illustrative of the sense of רצון, the following may properly be cited in this connection. The Latin and Greek equivalents to this word are thus stated from the Hebrew Lexicon of Cocceius, (ed. Schultz:) *Gratia, acceptatio, voluntas acquiescens, beneplacitum*. Greek, *ευδοκια, good-will; επιθυμια, strong desire; θελημα, will; χαρις, favor; ελεος, mercy; δεκτον, acceptable; αρεστον, agreeable*.

Isaiah xlix, 8: "Thus saith the Lord, In an *acceptable time* (בצה רצון) have I heard thee." A time of *favor* and *good-will*.

Isaiah lxi, 2: "To proclaim the *acceptable year* of the Lord, (צה רצון.)" To proclaim the year of the *good pleasure* of the Lord.

Psalm v, 12: "With *favor* (רצון) will thou compass me as with a shield."

Psalm xix, 14: "Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart be *acceptable* (לרצון, lit. for a pleasure) in thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my Redeemer."

Psalms cvi, 4: "Remember me, O Lord, with the *favor* (רַצוֹן) which thou bearest to thy people."

But we now return to the instances where the Hebrew terms are expressly rendered by the Greek *θελῶ*, *will*.

2 Samuel xxiii, 5: "For this is all my salvation and all my *desire*, (רָצוֹן, *θελῶ*.)"

1 Kings v, 8: "I will do all thy *desire* (רָצוֹן, *θελῶ*) concerning timber," etc.

Job xxi, 21: "For what *pleasure* (רָצוֹן, *θελῶ*) hath he in his house after him."

Psalms i, 2: "But his *delight* (רָצוֹן, *θελῶ*) is in the law of the Lord."

Ecclesiastes v, 4: "When thou vowest a vow unto God, defer not to pay it; for he hath no *pleasure* (רָצוֹן, *θελῶ*) in fools."

Isaiah xlv, 28: "That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my *pleasure*, (רָצוֹן, *θελῶ*.)"

Isaiah xlviii, 14: "The Lord hath loved him; he will do his *pleasure* (רָצוֹן, *θελῶ*) on Babylon."

Malachi i, 10: "I have no *pleasure* (רָצוֹן, *θελῶ*) in you, saith the Lord of Hosts."

Psalms xxx, 5: "His anger endureth but a moment; in his *favor* (רַצוֹן, *θελῶ*) is life."

Psalms xxx, 7: "Lord, by thy *favor* (רַצוֹן, *θελῶ*) thou hast made my mountain to stand strong."

Psalms xl, 8: "I delight to do thy *will*, (רָצוֹן, *θελῶ*.) O God."

Psalms ciii, 21: "Bless ye the Lord . . . ye ministers of his that do his *pleasure*, (רָצוֹן, *θελῶ*.)"

Psalms cxliii, 10: "Teach me to do thy *will*, (רָצוֹן, *θελῶ*.)"

The reader, we trust, will compliment our veracity so far as to believe that the above constitute a mere fraction of the cases of similar usage that might be adduced in illustration of the sense which we have affirmed of the phrase "will of God." Many of the instances cited refer, it is true, to the will of man, but they are still pertinent, as bearing on the purport of the expression. It is to be observed, moreover, that in a multitude of cases the original Hebrew employs a term which is not rendered in Greek by *θελω* or any of its derivatives, and yet conveys emphatically the sense of *complacent affection* which we have developed in the preceding pages. Thus רָצוֹן, *good pleasure*, for example, which is so frequently rendered by the Greek *θελω* or *θελῶ*, *will*, occurs in the following passages when the Greek rendering is various.

Leviticus i, 3: "He shall offer it of his own *voluntary will*, (רָצוֹן.)"

Leviticus xix, 5: "Ye shall offer it at *your own will*, (רצון)"
Comp. Leviticus xxii, 19, 29.

Deuteronomy xxxiii, 16: "And for the *good will* (רצון) of him that dwelt in the bush."

Ezra x, 11: "Make confession unto the Lord God of your fathers, and do *his pleasure*, (רצון)"

Proverbs xii, 2: "A good man obtaineth *favor* (רצון) of the Lord."

Isaiah lx, 10: "In my wrath I smote thee, but in my *favor* (רצון) have I had mercy on thee."

No doubt can linger in the mind of the intelligent reader, that the diction in the above texts presents an additional confirmation of the truth of our main position in regard to this genuine purport of the phrase "will of God." His will pertains to his affection, and its objects are the objects of his complacency, and of nothing else. We have admitted, indeed, that in some few cases the term *will* denotes *purpose* as predicated of God or of Christ, which is the same as saying that the divine *voluntas* sometimes issues in the divine *volitio*. The following texts belong to this category:

Matthew viii, 3: "And Jesus put forth his hand, and touched him, saying, *I will*, (θελω;) be thou clean." Mark i, 41; Luke v, 13, are parallel.

John v, 21: "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom *he will*, (θελει.)"

John xxi, 22: "Jesus saith unto him, if *I will* (θελω) that he tarry till I come," etc.

We find nothing more direct to the point than these few texts, and these militate not with our main averment. They merely intimate the *going into effect of the Divine willingness or proclivity*, so far as it bears upon the objects of his complacency or choice. But it is certainly remarkable that in such a vast majority of cases the sense of *voluntas* should prevail over that of *volitio*. Indeed, a doubt may be suggested whether there is any such thing as *volition*, strictly speaking, in the Divine mind; whether his *will* (*voluntas*) be not an *infinite spontaneity*, acting from eternity and unknowing of distinct volitive operations. The truest conception, perhaps, of the Divine nature, is that of an infinite, eternal, irrepressible, and overwhelming lovingness, which yearns with ineffable longings for the highest good of every creature, and which only fails to realize its desires because it *cannot* without destroying the highest prerogative of the creature. The possibility of evil must be permitted, and if permitted, its native consequences must follow, though even here it may be doubted whether the punishment of the wicked in hell involves

any distinct volition to that effect, inasmuch as the contrariety of moral state, apart from any direct infliction from the Divine hand, will have all the effect of positive and punitive wrath. In this case infinite love will be itself the punisher. So when the eyes are diseased, the light of the sun is painful. The patient is conscious of a certain antagonism between the beams of the bright luminary of day and his own organs of vision. But no change has taken place in the sun. It still shines serene, majestic, and glorious, rejoicing all eyes that are not incapacitated by their own state for welcoming his reviving rays.

But whatever may be granted or denied on this head, the result of the whole previous induction satisfies us that the phrase in question, as defined by the dominant usage of sacred writ, is never, in a single instance, predicated of that in which the Divine Being does not take complacency. In strict propriety of speech the Lord never *wills* that which is intrinsically evil. He may permit it; he may overrule it; he may educe good out of it; but he never *wills* it. The object of his *will* is evermore the object of his *love*, and as he cannot love evil, so neither can he will it. If he can or does, where is the proof? Our display of the Scripture usage has been virtually exhaustive, and not an iota of countervailing testimony has been detected. The single text in Ezek. xviii, 23, "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God," may be regarded as an exponent of the general doctrine of the Word on this question before us. The Greek rendering is here peculiarly emphatic: "*In willing, or with the will, I will not will* (*μη θελησει θελω*) the death of the sinner." Such an event is utterly without the range of the *Divine will*. With an infinite sincerity he deprecates such an issue.

If, then, our conclusion on this head may be conceded to stand unassailable, important corollaries unavoidably ensue. The distinction of the Divine will into *secret* and *revealed* vanishes into thin air. God has but one will, and that is eternally determined to ends that accord with his infinite benevolence. In the case of Joseph, for instance, it is often held that while his brethren were bound, in obedience to the Lord's revealed will, to demean themselves toward him kindly, justly, and fraternally, and thus to do him no wrong, yet that there was a secret undercurrent of the Divine will wafting him toward Egypt, and purposing to bring about the entire train of events that subsequently transpired, and which exerted such a controlling influence upon the later destinies of the children of Israel and of the Church in all after ages. But how can Jehovah be said to have *willed* the hard lot of Joseph in the

pit or the prison, or the cruel conduct of his brethren, when his inmost soul abhorred their treachery and deceit? What more can be said than that he did not prevent, that is, that he *permitted* the demonstration that was made of their dispositions toward him, and the whole train of sequences which followed? God had, indeed, a hand and a meaning in all that befell his servant, but he *willed* nothing more in relation to it than the *good* which he determined to bring out of it, and in this he exercised that prerogative of sovereignty which he never foregoes. "Ye meant it for evil, but the Lord meant it for good." That is, he willed the good of the end, but not the evil of the means. These he always can and always will keep separate and distinct from each other. In this view the doctrine of the Divine *permission of evil*, founded upon the free volitions of responsible agents, is one of the utmost importance in the great system of truth; but its importance will only appear in proportion as it is kept utterly aloof from all contact with the actings of the *Divine will*. Yet this absolute separation or segregation is not of easy attainment. In ascending to the highest plane from which to survey the bearings of our theme, and contemplating the introduction of moral evil into the universe, together with the deadly fruits which it works out in the final perdition of the ungodly, it is hard to avoid compromising the *will* of Jehovah in the fearful issues which have accrued. What takes place under his eye is supposed to take place with his concurrence and complicity, and the idea of such a concurrence naturally merges into the idea of positive and efficacious *will*. Even Edwards, in his great work on the "Freedom of the Human Will," runs the wheel of his logical chariot so extremely close to the edge of the precipice, that it is hard to say it is not sometimes carried over. From the ensuing extracts it is evident that he *intends* to steer clear of the threatening peril, and save the credit of the Divine purity and equity in their relations to evil, but we venture not to say that he has succeeded. Let the reader judge.

"There is no inconsistency in supposing that God may hate a thing, as it is in itself and considered as evil, and yet that it may be his will that it should come to pass, considering all its consequences. I believe there is no person of good understanding who will venture to say he is certain that it is impossible it should be best, taking in the whole compass and extent of existence, and all consequences in the endless series of events, that there should be such a thing as moral evil in this world. And if so it will certainly follow that an infinitely wise being, who always chooses what is best, *must choose that there should be such a thing*; and if so, then such a choice is not an evil, but a wise and holy choice; and if so, then Providence, which is agreeable to such a choice, is a wise and holy Providence. Men do *will* sin as sin, and so are the authors and actors of it; they love it as sin, and for evil ends and purposes.

God does not will sin as sin, or for the sake of anything evil, though it be *his pleasure so to order things* that, he permitting, *sin will come to pass*, for the sake of the great good that by his disposal shall be the consequence. *His willing to order things so that evil shall come to pass* for the sake of contrary good, is no argument that he does not hate evil as evil."—*Freedom of Will*, p. iv, § 9.

It is difficult to make of this anything less than a concession that the Most High, in effect, *wills* the entrance of sin into the world; that this is his pleasure; that, for the sake of a great good, he *chooses* that there shall be such a thing as moral evil; and if he thus *chooses* it, how can we avoid the inference that he exerts a *positive efficiency* in bringing it to pass? We do not characterize the theory as we should did we regard this inference as the true-meant and deliberate conviction of the writer. His better promptings would fain repudiate the Divine connivance with sin, and yet the leadings of his logic involved him unconsciously in the paradox. He imposed upon himself by means of the subtlety of his speculations, and really made God the author of sin, while endeavoring to vindicate him from the charge. "If by the *author of sin* be meant the permitter or not hinderer of sin, and at the same time *the disposer of a state of events in such a manner*, for wise, holy, and most excellent ends and purposes, that sin (if it be permitted or not hindered) will most certainly and infallibly follow; I say, if this be all that is meant by being the author of sin, I do not deny that God is the author of sin; (though I dislike and reject the phrase, as that which by use and custom is apt to carry another sense;) it is no reproach for the Most High to be thus the author of sin."

There is unquestionably a fallacy latent in the words "dispose," "disposal," "order," "orderer," etc., so frequently employed by Edwards in this connection. Thus, in speaking of the sin of Pharaoh, he says that "God *ordered* the obstinacy of Pharaoh;" in like manner that he "*ordered* the sin and folly of Sihon, king of the Amorites, in refusing to let the people of Israel pass by him peaceably;" that he "*ordered* the treacherous rebellion of Zedekiah against the king of Babylon;" that he "*ordered* the rapine and unrighteous ravages of Nebuchadnezzar in spoiling and ruining the nations round about." So, also, he remarks: "It is certain that God, for excellent, holy, gracious, and glorious ends, *ordered* the fact which they committed who were concerned in Christ's death; and that herein *they did but fulfill God's designs*. It is very manifest, by many Scriptures, that the whole affair of Christ's crucifixion, with its circumstances, and the treachery of Judas, that made way for it, was *ordered* in God's providence, in pursuance of his purpose." Once more: "It is manifest that God sometimes

permits sin to be committed, and at the same time *orders things so*, that if he permits the fact it will come to pass, because on some accounts he sees it needful, and of importance, that it should come to pass."

To a true view of this subject it is necessary, we think, to conceive of the "ordering" and "disposing" on the part of God as coming in *subsequent* to the occurrence of the evil events, and not *prior*. If we think of the Divine agency as concerned in *previously* "ordering" the actions of men in executing wicked volitions, it is next to impossible to draw mentally the line of demarcation between such "ordering" and the actual authorship of evil. But let it be understood to be the prerogative of the Most High to "order," control, and overrule the actions of wicked men *after* they are consummated, so as to educe the most signal good out of them, and we clear the skirts of the All-perfect from any positive participation in the evil which he permits. On this head we will listen a little further to the reasonings of our author, and then sum up our conclusions:

"On the whole, it is manifest that God may be, in the manner which has been described, the Orderer and Disposer of that event which, in the inherent subject, is moral evil, and yet his so doing may be no moral evil. He may will the disposal of such an event, and its coming to pass, for good ends, and his will not be an immoral or sinful will, but a perfect holy will; and he may actually, in his providence, so dispose and permit things, that the event may be certainly and infallibly connected with such disposal and permission, and his act therein not be an immoral or unholy, but a perfectly holy act. Sin may be an evil thing, and yet that there should be such a disposal and permission as that it should come to pass, may be a good thing. The crucifixion of Christ, if we consider only those things which belong to the event as it proceeded from his murderers, was in many respects the most heinous and horrid of all acts; but consider it as *it was willed and ordered of God*, in the extent of his designs and views, it was the most admirable and glorious of all events. Consequently the crucifixion *might be agreeable to his will*, though this will may be secret, that is, not revealed in God's law."—*Freedom of Will*, p. iv, § 9.

Now in all this it is evident that, before assenting to it, we require to know what idea, precisely, the author would have us attach to the terms *order* and *dispose*. They predicate some agency of the Most High put forth *before* the occurrence of the events specified, and going, it would seem, to *necessitate* the volitions which should result in them. But how can God be conceived as controlling the wills of free agents, and *determining* them to certain results without at the same time discharging them of responsibility and assuming it all himself? But how, again, can he do this in regard to an event which is directly contrary to his very nature, which he inwardly abhors, and which therefore he imperatively forbids? Can the same thing be at once the object of his

will and the object of his *prohibition*? Yet it will be observed that Edwards speaks of the death of Christ as "*willed and ordered of God*," and says moreover that "God's *willing* the event was the most holy volition of God that was ever made known to men." Now we are greatly in error if we have not shown that no warrant can be produced from the language of Holy Writ for applying the term *Divine will* to any action or event that is intrinsically evil. Jehovah never *wills* what he does not *love*, and such an event as the crucifixion of the Lord of life, by the murderous hands of wicked men, could never, by any possibility, come into the category of the Divine volitions. How tremendous the wo denounced upon his betrayer: "Wo to that man! it were good if he had never been born." With this denunciation sounding in our ears, can we concede for a moment that there is the least propriety in saying that the Most High *willed* the death of Christ through the guilty hands of Judas, of the Jewish priests, and the Roman rulers? Assuredly not. It was not *willed*, but simply *permitted*.

But we anticipate the objection drawn from the express words of Scripture: "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." Acts ii, 23. Our reply is drawn from the same source. The "determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" here spoken of is not any Divine decree viewed *per se*, or as existing unuttered in the recesses of God's bosom, but simply the *futurition of the event as previously announced in the inspired oracles*. It is there that we are to look for the predetermination affirmed in the present passage. Of this there can be no doubt upon a comparison of parallel Scriptures. Thus we read, Matt. xxvi, 24: "The Son of man goeth, as it is written of him;" while in Luke xxii, 22, it is said: "And truly the Son of man goeth, as it was determined." The *being written* and the *being determined* are plainly equivalent. The whole ground is abundantly covered by the following sentence from Paul's speech in the synagogue of Antioch: "For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets, which are read every Sabbath-day; they have fulfilled them in condemning him." Acts xiii, 27. From his divine prescience the Lord could, of course, through the prophets, announce the fact as future, while at the same time it was wholly independent of his *will* properly so termed.

The spirit of these remarks applies to the whole theme of moral evil in all its departments. In all cases, without exception, it is contrary to the Divine will, and yet it is inevitable and unprevent-

able so long as man remains man; for freedom is essential to humanity. Let a circle once be described, and all the lines drawn from the center to the circumference must of necessity be equal. It is no impeachment of Omnipotence to say that it cannot make them unequal while the circle remains a circle. In like manner, when the Deity has once created a man, he must leave him free to will in accordance with his own will, or contrary to it. The possibility of the abuse of his liberty is as essential to his nature as the coequality of the radii to the nature of the circle. Omnipotence is as powerless in relation to the one as to the other.

ART. X.—RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Protestantism.—THE RELATION BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE is slowly but steadily transforming itself. The time when they will be entirely separated may still be far distant, but that many points must be changed, and that the interference of the State in matters purely ecclesiastical must cease, is more and more agreed upon by all parties. The disestablishment of the Church of England may still be considered by many Churchmen as a grave calamity, but they must admit that it is obviously possible. The bishops tell their clergy that the days of dependence on the State are gone by, and that if the Church will not lose her influence on the masses forever, she must re-establish it by her own energy. One of the relics of English State Churchism which had long been obnoxious to men of all parties, the "State Services" for the anniversaries of the Gunpowder Treason, (Nov. 5,) the martyrdom of King Charles I., (Jan. 30,) and the restoration of King Charles II., (May 29,) have at length been abandoned by a royal warrant. THE CONFLICT OF THE HIGH CHURCH AND LOW CHURCH PARTIES loses nothing of its violence. Rev. Mr. Cheyne having declared himself unwilling to retract those views on the Real Presence, on account of which he had been suspended by the Bishop of Aberdeen, the Episcopal Synod of Scotland has again confirmed his suspension, Bishop Forbes of Brechin only dissenting. The leaders of the High Church party, in England, condemn the decision of the Scottish bishops

in strong terms. Archdeacon Denison thinks that the teaching of the Scottish bishops is the same as the pernicious doctrines of Zwinglius and Calvin, and that it is a futile thing, not to say worse, to talk, as some High Church papers have done, of a Real Presence which is not the Real Presence. According to a letter of Dr. Pusey, this is the first time since the Reformation that the doctrine of the Real Presence has been condemned by the bishops of a Church which is in communion with the Church of England. He consoles himself, however, with the consideration that no article or formulary of the Church, which are the real teachers of the people, has been changed. The same consideration has been adduced by the High Church party of Scotland for not executing their first design, to establish a Free Episcopal Church. Rev. Mr. Poole, of St. Barnabas, Pimlico, whose license had been withdrawn by the Bishop of London for grave charges brought against him in connection with his use of the confessional, has applied to the Court of Queen's Bench for a *mandamus* to compel the Archbishop of Canterbury to issue a commission of inquiry into the alleged ground on which his license had been withdrawn, and the court has given judgment in his favor, the Lord Chief Justice Campbell, and the three other judges present, all expressing their opinion that Mr. Poole was clearly entitled to a full investigation. Notwithstanding the estrangement which exists between the two great parties, and which seems to widen every year, they still work harmoniously together in many

societies and for many reforms in the Church. Thus the SPECIAL SERVICES, which in the large cities have been held for the special benefit of the laboring classes, are warmly recommended by both. These extra services have been everywhere a great success. The opening of St. Paul's, London, on the first Sunday of Advent, attracted from 80,000 to 100,000 people, many of whom, being unable to gain admission at St. Paul's, thronged the majority of the city churches. The church has ever since been crowded, but the High Churchmen complain that none of their party has been selected to preach except Dr. Hook, the Vicar of Leeds, whose views, moreover, have considerably "lowered" in late years. THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS are about to abandon formally some of their distinctive peculiarities. A conference of three hundred of the members of the Society was held in London recently, at which it was agreed to sanction marriages between individuals of this community (although not in membership) by allowing them to take place in its religious meetings, and that all restrictions in regard to what is called plainness of speech, behavior, and apparel, may also be discontinued, but confirming its ancient testimony in favor of Christian moderation in these respects.

The Roman Catholic Church.—As the feelings of a large portion of the Protestant population are obviously opposed to the annual support of the Roman Catholic COLLEGE OF MAYNOOTH, suggestions have been lately made to substitute for the annual grant a gross sum. The *Freeman's Journal*, the old daily organ of the Irish Roman Catholics, thinks that the Roman Catholic bishops might not be altogether indisposed "to terminate the bitterness which sectaries have extracted out of a national right to a national exchequer for the education of the national clergy," and suggests, at a rough guess, that the grant might be exchanged for £1,000,000 pounds sterling, reserving to the college the present building and land. The *Tablet*, a Catholic weekly, says that rumors are afloat that CATHOLIC LITERARY ENTERPRISES are, for the most part, a losing speculation; that there is everywhere, more or less a decline in the sale of Catholic books, and a certain absence of literary enthusiasm on the Catholic public.

GERMANY.

Protestantism.—THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE EVANGELICAL PARTY in all Ger-

many is likely to be considerably advanced by the establishment of a new central organ, the *New Evangelical Church Gazette*, which is published in Berlin since January, 1859. For many years no new paper has appeared under the auspices of so many illustrious names, the prospectus being signed by nearly all the great theologians of Germany, and by a number of laymen, who rank among the greatest scholars of our times, such as Professor Karl Ritter, the celebrated geographer, Professor H. Ritter, the author of the *History of Philosophy*, and Professor Fichte of Tübingen, one of the most distinguished German philosophers. In Prussia the government of the State Church is at present under the control of the evangelical party, for the Prince Regent has called Herr Von Bethman-Hollweg, a leading man in the party, to the Ministry of Worship. In the new second Chamber, however, the Rationalistic Union Party is believed to have a very strong majority. In the Grand Duchy of Baden a great excitement has been created among the people by the known intention of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council, to introduce, in accordance with a resolution of the last General Synod, a new liturgy, which contains the principal parts of the Lutheran mass. The remonstrances and petitions of a large number of Church Councils have induced the Grand Duke to order the postponement of its obligatory introduction until the next General Synod. In the Grand Duchy of Hesse-Darmstadt, the friends of an Evangelical Union have held a conference at Friedeburg, which was largely attended by clergymen, and in which also many distinguished laymen, as the Prince of Solms-Lich, took part. In Württemberg, one of the six diocesan synods has almost unanimously expressed the wish, that a General Synod of the Evangelical State Church may be convoked soon, and that the Church may be placed more independent of the state. THE LUTHERAN PARTY has improved its organization in the three Hessian States, (Hesse-Darmstadt, Hesse-Cassel, and Hesse-Homburg,) where they now hold semi-annual conferences, the last of which took place at Marburg, and was presided over by Professor Vilmar, of Marburg, so well known for his Romanizing tendencies. In Prussia several clergymen of the State Church, with a part of their congregations, have joined the old Lutheran Church. In Baden the Lutheran party is now nearly extinct, as its last leaders among the

clergy have left the State Church. THE RATIONALISTIC PARTY has made attempts to rally in Baden, and especially in the Bavarian Palatinate, but it has hardly gained any ground. It places great hopes on the change of government which has taken place in Prussia, though the free congregations and German Catholics have been again forbidden, in several places, to hold their regular meetings. PROTESTANTISM IN AUSTRIA must have made some progress in the northern provinces, for the Bishops of Bohemia have found it necessary to warn the Catholics against the Protestant propaganda. In the Tyrol they have at length received the right to purchase landed property and to bury their dead according to the rites of their Churches. But the urgent petitions of the Hungarians for permission to frame a new ecclesiastical constitution have not been granted, and in the Lutheran Church of the German provinces, the preaching of missionary sermons has been forbidden by the Protestant Consistory, from fear they might be considered as a demonstration against the Jesuits.

The Roman Catholic Church.—THE CATHOLIC CHURCH OF AUSTRIA has held provincial synods in three of the seventeen ecclesiastical provinces. Great efforts have been made by the bishops, by the Catholic press, and the official papers of the government, to awaken in the people an interest in these assemblies, but with very little success. The emperor, however, has availed himself of this opportunity to assure the bishops of the ecclesiastical province of Vienna, that their endeavors to give to the development of a stronger ecclesiastical life a well-considered, firm foundation, meet with his warmest sympathy. A new decree on the Reorganization of Public Instruction provides that even every private school must have a denominational character, and that children of Catholic parents cannot be admitted to any non-Catholic schools; while, on the other hand, the Catholic schools are permitted to admit a limited number of children of other denominations. Circulars have been issued from all the departments of the ministry, by which the subaltern officers, the burgo-masters included, are apprised of the determined will of the emperor, that all the public officers shall set an example to the people in respecting the Church and the clergy. Encouraged by such extraordinary favors, the Catholic party has even dared to propose the re-establishment

of the censorship of the Church over all literary productions. If, nevertheless, the Catholic Church in Austria increases but slowly in power and influence, it is, for a great part, owing to the dissatisfaction of a large portion of the priesthood with both the institutions and the doctrines of their Church. The Catholic party will be the last to deny this important fact, as during the past year the bishops, to whom Rome has committed the reformation of the monks, have met, on the part of most convents, with an obstinate resistance. These facts being generally known, a rumor that upward of five hundred priests had petitioned the bishops for the abolition of celibacy, and for other reforms, was readily believed, though no proofs have as yet been adduced for its truth, which is denied by the Catholic press. THE CATHOLIC PARTY IN PRUSSIA has gained, at the last elections of the Second Chamber, a few members, and its talented leader, August Reichen-sperger, of Cologne, has, in consequence of the coalition of the Catholics with the Liberals, been again elected first vice-president of the Second Chamber. The party intends, however, to drop its former name in the Parliament, in order to give to the Prince Regent, who has appointed a Catholic his Prime Minister, a proof of their confidence. THE RELATION OF THE OTHER GERMAN STATES TO ROME has changed but little. In Wirtemberg there still exists a great excitement on account of the Concordat, and it is believed that the Second Chamber will refuse to ratify it. In the Duchy of Anhalt-Dessau, the first Catholic church has been consecrated in the capital by the Papal Nuncio of Munich, who has been highly gratified at the very liberal disposition of the duke toward his Catholic subjects. A new proof of the strong ATTACHMENT OF THE CATHOLIC ARISTOCRACY TO THEIR CHURCH has been furnished during the past year by the considerable increase of candidates for the priesthood and monastic orders from their midst. Thus a daughter of the richest nobleman of the Prussian Rhine provinces, the Count of Furstenberg-Stammheim, has lately taken the solemn vows as a nun, and on the same day a cousin of hers was received as a novice.

The Greek Church.—As Russia does not cease to make secret efforts for inclining the UNITED GREEK CHURCH toward a separation from Rome, the Papal Nuncio at Vienna has made a tour through

Hungary and Transylvania, in order to obtain reliable information concerning the real state of affairs. Catholic papers say that he is fully satisfied with the result of his investigations.

SCANDINAVIA.

Protestantism.—A large portion of THE LUTHERAN CLERGY of Sweden and Norway continues to be strongly attached to hierarchical principles, and are opposing, to the utmost of their ability, though without success, the efforts of the many dissenting denominations, which on all sides are extending their operations. Foremost among these are still THE BAPTISTS, who spread in Sweden, in spite of continuing persecution, with extraordinary rapidity. From the small beginning made in 1849, when the first Baptist Church was organized, they have increased to forty-five churches, sixty-two pastors and colporteurs, and two thousand one hundred and five members. A gentleman who is not a Baptist, annoyed by the intolerance and bigotry of the teachers of the national schools, has offered twenty thousand Swedish dollars for the erection of a school on Baptist principles. Colporteurs are at work in every province except the eastern ones, where the prejudice against all lay agency is so powerful that it shuts it out almost completely. Also in Denmark the work is onward, and promises a glorious future. THE METHODISTS have been equally successful in Norway. They have seventy members at Frederickshald, and one hundred and fifty-six at Sarpsburg, and small congregations have been collected in two other places. They have also commenced operations in Denmark, and the superintendent of the Scandinavian mission has taken up his permanent residence in Copenhagen. A bill for establishing a Supreme Ecclesiastical Council in the NATIONAL CHURCH OF DENMARK has been defeated in the Lower House of the Diet by a considerable majority, and there are no prospects for the Church to extricate herself soon from the disordered condition in which she has been since 1849.

BELGIUM.

The Roman Catholic Church.—THE LIBERAL PARTY is unrelenting in its efforts to arrest the progress of ultramontane principles. The book-market abounds in anti-Catholic books, but most of the liberal writers know not what religious belief to substitute for that which they

attack, and have no other cause to plead than that of Atheism and Materialism. Some towns have tried to take the public instruction out of the hands of the priesthood; but the Liberals, as a party, have not yet been able to unite on a scheme for organizing a system of public instruction independent of the influence of the bishops. An ultramontane professor of the State University of Ghent, who taught the temporal power of the Pope, has been promptly removed, and a distinguished Protestant of Germany has received a call to the same university as Professor of Chemistry. THE BISHOPS, at their last meeting at Malines, have resolved that no clergyman shall teach at a school which does not adhere to the principles of the Convention of Antwerp, by which a compromise between the government and the bishops with regard to public institutions was effected. They also recommend to the Flemish congregations the new Flemish translation of the Holy Scriptures, made by Professor Vraton of Louvain. THE INTEREST IN FOREIGN MISSIONS shows itself, especially with regard to the United States of America and Scandinavia. The Ecclesiastical Seminary founded at Louvain for supplying America with European priests, has about twenty students, and has already fitted out several priests for the United States. The superior states that he can find an almost unlimited number of candidates, if the necessary pecuniary means can be procured. For the new Vicariate Apostolic of Greenland and of the northern parts of Norway and Sweden a similar scheme of special support is under deliberation.

Protestantism.—The last annual report of the *Société Evangelique Belge* states that, during the past year, besides the opening of evangelical worship in several other places of greater or less importance, the society has founded new stations in Namur and Louvain, two of the most important towns in Belgium. All the stations have witnessed, during the past year, a great progress, especially those of Lize-Seraing, Jumet, and Charleroi. A very encouraging report on the PROGRESS OF PROTESTANTISM was likewise made by the Committee of Evangelization of the Evangelical State Church, which held its last annual synod in August. The committee supports six Protestant schools with four hundred and fifty children.

HOLLAND.

Protestantism.—THE LUTHERAN CHURCH, which since 1791 has been divided

into two different bodies, generally called the Evangelical Lutheran Church and the Reformed Evangelical Lutheran Church, is likely to be soon reunited, both parties having made some advances for this purpose. The want of interest in FOREIGN MISSIONS, with which the Protestant Churches of Holland generally have been charged for many years, is especially felt by the sister Churches in view of the great openings for Christianity in Asia. The few persons who go out from Holland as missionaries are scarcely sufficient to meet the wants of a hundredth part of the heathen and Mohammedan population of Java and the surrounding islands.

The Roman Catholic Church. —

The Pope, notified by THE JANSENISTS, who call themselves the unhappy and disowned sons of the Catholic Church, of the election of a new Archbishop of Utrecht, has answered with a new brief of excommunication. The denomination has decreased, since the beginning of the present century, in numbers, and counts at present some five thousand members. But since the proclamation of the new dogma of the Immaculate Conception, new sympathies for it have sprung up in France, Italy, Spain, and Germany, and it is thought that a combination of these elements may lead to a new episcopalian reaction against the strictly Papal system which at present prevails in the Roman Catholic Church.

FRANCE.

The Roman Catholic Church. —

THE CATHOLIC PARTY has taken great offense at the warlike demonstration of Louis Napoleon against Austria, for it is the favorite dream of the *Univers* and its followers, that France and Austria are designed by Providence to reconvert, by their combined influence, and if necessary by force of arms, the whole of Europe to the Roman Catholic Church. Not less have their feelings been wounded by a report of Prince Napoleon, the governor of Algeria, to the emperor, on the expediency of having the Jewish population of the colony represented in the Councils-General, in order to manifest, by an act of government, that the equality of creeds before the laws of France is absolute and complete. Prince Napoleon has never been considered as a docile son of the Church, but the appointment of four Israelites as members of the Councils-General of Algiers, Oran, and Constantine, has furnished a

new proof that even the emperor cannot always be relied upon. The marriage of Prince Napoleon with the eldest daughter of the King of Sardinia, displeases the Catholic party likewise; for the King of Sardinia is looked upon as the banner-bearer of an anti-Catholic liberalism among the European princes. On the other hand, the Catholic party feels great satisfaction with the progress of the French-Spanish expedition against Cochinchina, where an important town has been taken and declared French property. They hope that the French government will seize on the whole territory, and make it a French-Indian empire, with the Catholic Church as the State Church. THE MONASTIC ORDERS AND RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATIONS continue to multiply. Among the former, the *Petites Sœurs des Pauvres*, (Little Sisters of the Poor,) spread with unusual rapidity. Though founded only a few years, (the foundress, formerly a female servant, still lives,) they have at present fifty houses. Their object is to establish homes for poor old men and women, and to nurse them. They have received calls from nearly every large city of France, and a house and furniture is generally given them by the city councils. Some of the orders, however, commence again, as in former centuries, to occupy themselves with very worldly pursuits. Thus the austere Trappists have commenced, in Algeria, to manufacture and sell perfumes in such quantities as to injure the business of other manufacturers, who declare themselves unable to compete with the Trappists, because the latter are subsidized by the government. Among the associations, the new Society of St. Francis de Sales, which was founded about a year ago, and whose object is to counteract the success of the Protestant missionaries among the Catholic population, has been prominent for its zeal. A most fanatical sermon was preached at its first anniversary, held in Paris, in November, by its president, the blind Monseigneur de Segur, who represented history as a warfare between the Lord of Creation, Jesus, his angels, saints and Christians, his Roman Catholic Church, with its visible head, the Pope, on one side, and the first of created beings after the Holy Virgin, namely, Lucifer, the revolted archangel, his demons, hypocrites, infidels, heretics, with all his emissaries, without a visible head, on the other. The annual report furnished numerous items showing the great progress of Protestantism in all parts of France.

Protestantism.—THE CONSTANT PROCESS OF PROTESTANTISM is attested, as we have shown above, by the Catholics themselves. Numerous other proofs are furnished by the Protestant papers of every week, while the cases in which French Protestants are received into the Roman Catholic Church are extremely rare. The Evangelical Church of Lyons counts at present about six hundred members, nearly all of whom were formerly Catholics. The same was reported at a late meeting of the French branch of the Evangelical Alliance by one of the Baptist pastors of his denomination. Three out of four pastors, and three hundred out of four hundred members, have come from the Catholic Church. By this great progress NEW ACTS OF OPPRESSION are occasioned, especially in the provinces. A glaring case occurred recently in the department of Haute Vienne, where, in 1852, twelve evangelical schools had been closed at a time by order of the government. After many fruitless efforts to obtain an authorization for reopening them, the Protestants at length flattered themselves with the hope that all the requisites of the law had been complied with, that the Minister of Public Instruction was in favor of their request, and that no opposition would any longer be made to them. Nevertheless the Prefect and the *Conseil Académique* of the department persisted in refusing the demanded authorization, and the *Conseil Départemental*, the highest authority in such matters, when appealed to, confirmed, "after a mature deliberation," as the Minutes say, "unanimously in the interest of public morality," the decision of the Prefect. THE NUMBER OF PROTESTANT PERIODICALS having been, during 1858, again increased by two, amounts now to twenty, among which there are two weeklies and fifteen monthlies.

RUSSIA.

The Greek Church.—THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW ECCLESIASTICAL SEMINARY at Tomsk, for the Eparchez of Tomsk, which comprises the two large governments of Tomsk and Yeniseisk, is the first step taken for the education of priests of the Russian Church in those distant regions, and a new proof that the emperor does not mean to exclude the National Church from his vast projects of reform. THE CONFIDENCE OF THE GREEK CLERGY IN THE EMPEROR has been greatly strengthened by the strict observance of the religious rites and customs which on

several occasions he has recently displayed. He has called his youngest son after one of the favorite saints of Russia, St. Sergius, and he has twice visited the monastery of this saint near Moscow, the first time for the special purpose of imploring the help of the saint for the safe delivery of the empress, and the second time for returning thanks. THE SECTS OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH have been lately made the subject of an elaborate article in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, which maintains that the measures adopted against them by the Emperor Nicholas have not only failed, but have had the effect of increasing their numbers. They enjoy now a greater toleration. Their marriages and children are no longer considered illegitimate, but passports for traveling in foreign countries are still refused to them.

The Roman Catholic Church.

—SEVERAL NEW CASES OF PERSECUTION against the Roman Catholic Church have been reported by the *Univers* of Paris. The inhabitants of the village Pawlow, near Vilna, though not slaves, are said to have been compelled by the Governor General Nasinov to join the Russian Church, and even the knout, according to these reports, has been again employed to prevent former members of the Greek United Church from reuniting with the Catholic Church, which they had expressed the desire to do. The *Nord*, a Russian paper in Brussels, has denied the truth of these reports, but has admitted that the laws which forbid the reception of any member of the Greek Church into that of Rome, are maintained by order of the emperor in their full vigor. The statements of the Catholic press, on the other hand, are corroborated by the Russian correspondents of the paper published by Alexander Herzen, a Russian refugee in London, so that it is likely that they are substantially true. STILL THE RELATIONS BETWEEN RUSSIA AND ROME are of a more amicable nature than they were under Nicholas, and some more of the vacant bishoprics have been filled. Among a part of the aristocracy a Rome-ward tendency undoubtedly exists, which has induced the Pope to provide for a regular Russian service in the city of Rome. A celebrated Russian member of the Redemptorist order, Father Petcherine, has for that purpose been called to Rome. A STRONG OPPOSITION TO ROME is arising in Poland, partly from a new sect, founded by the mystic poet Towianski, who believes himself to be a new Messiah

for the reformation of the Catholic Church, partly from writers who proclaim either the radicalism of Young Poland or the Panslavonian doctrines, which begin to agitate the whole east of Europe. The Roman Index Librorum Prohibitorum proscribes one Polish book after another. But the thunder of the Vatican has lost its effect; instead of striking terror into trembling authors, it is welcomed by them as a cheap and efficient means of attracting general attention to their works.

Evangelical Lutheran Church.—

THE PUBLICATION OF A THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, which the faculty of the University of Dorpat has started at the beginning of the present year, is likely to prove an event of importance. It will give to Russia a more learned Protestant clergy, and thus strengthen the present ascendancy of Protestant ideas in the rising literature of Eastern Europe. At the same time it will aim at bringing about a closer union between the Lutherans of Russia and those of other countries, and thus be another step for the consolidation of the Lutheran Church in Europe, and for her final deliverance from the fetters of the State. Her prosperity in Russia, it is hoped, will be increased by THE AUTHORIZED ESTABLISHMENT OF A CENTRAL ECCLESIASTICAL FUND, from which schools and churches will be built, pastors and teachers supported, and all the enterprises of the Church promoted. This authorization, which had been in vain solicited during the reign of Nicholas, cannot fail to prove highly advantageous to the interests of Russian Protestantism.

Buddhism.—Buddhism, though on the decrease, is not yet extinct in Russia. According to a work of Bishop Nil on Buddhism, there were, at the beginning of the present century, two Buddhist bishoprics in Russia, one in Nerchinsk, the other on this side of the Yablonoi mountains, on the lake of Gunse. Now only the latter is in existence. In 1822 there were in Russia 2,532 lamas, now only 285, with a Buddhist population of about 124,000 souls.

TURKEY.

Mohammedanism.—The fanaticism of the MOHAMMEDAN POPULATION still remains unabated, and gains new strength from the increasing progress of Christianity. According to the *Univers* fanatic Sheiks are going over the whole country, espe-

cially the Asiatic portion, to preach a crusade against the Christians, and are forming in the cities confraternities for the defense of the faith. In several, and perhaps in all the mosques of Constantinople, the people have been warned against buying and reading the Bible, and the call for the Bible has consequently diminished. The government, however, has given another proof of its liberal disposition toward the Christians, by ordering the execution of the instigators of the great massacre of Christians at Jiddah, in Arabia. Social improvements, also, are carried on with undiminished vigor. In Europe the proportion of Mohammedans is constantly decreasing, and the power of the Mohammedan element is moreover broken by the springing up of new sects, the last of which made its appearance during the past year at Gaza, and is said to hold Pantheistic doctrines, and to say nothing about the prophet.

The Greek Church.—THE REORGANIZATION OF THE GREEK CHURCH is pro-

ceeding very slowly. At length a council of reform has been convened, consisting of seven clerical and thirty-one lay members. Two months have been consumed by the new council in discussing the mode of electing the Patriarch of Constantinople. The laymen demanded that he be elected by a direct vote of the Assembly, which would secure to them a majority, while the prelates called this a violation of the sacred canons, and claimed the right of being the sole electors. The parties being unable to come to an agreement, it has been proposed, as a compromise, that the sacred synod shall elect the patriarch among five candidates proposed by the council of administration. THE INFLUENCE OF RUSSIA on the Greek Church of Turkey seems to be increasing. Seven new establishments for the clergy and pilgrims of Russia are in the course of building in Palestine, and the Archimandrite Njegush of Montenegro has been induced to go to St. Petersburg and not to Constantinople, to receive the consecration as bishop.

The Roman Catholic Church.—

Some of THE BISHOPS are displaying a great zeal for advancing the interests of Rome. The Vicar Apostolic of Bosnia has built in his diocese, during the last three years, twelve new churches and seventeen new schools. The Pope's late delegate in Syria, Archbishop Brunoni, has witnessed, during the five years

that he has resided in Syria, the reception into the Roman Catholic Church of five thousand members of the Eastern Churches. Having been recently transferred to the Vicariate Apostolic of Constantinople, Archbishop Brunoni has paid an official visit to the patriarchs of the Greek and Armenian Churches, which is considered as the forerunner of new attempts to effect a corporate union of those two Churches with Rome. THE UNITED GREEK CHURCH has been greatly disturbed during the whole past year by the attempts of its patriarch, and of Rome, to introduce into the calendar the new style instead of the old. The patriarch, seeing himself unable to overcome the resistance of a large portion of his people, and, it is said, even fearing for his life, resigned in August, and returned to the convent of the Basilians, in which he had lived before his elevation to the patriarchate. His resignation having, however, not been accepted by the pope, he has been compelled to return to his patriarchal see. The controversy, and the excitement arising from it, are not yet settled, and the bishop sent by Russia to Palestine has been invited by the leaders of the anti-Roman party to Damascus, in order to bring about a union between them and the Orthodox Greek Church.

Protestantism.—THE PROTESTANT SCHOOLS which have been established by the American missionaries enjoy a great prosperity. Thus, a girl's school at Nicomedia, which is now self-supporting, has fifty-seven pupils, chiefly from the higher families of the Armenians, who are very well pleased with it. At Sidon the Protestant school was so generally attended by Catholic children that it required threats of excommunication on the part of the Bishop of Tyre to cause the withdrawal of some of them. Greater attention than before will be paid to EUROPEAN TURKEY as a missionary field. The whole country has been mapped out and divided between the American Board and the Methodist Episcopal Church. Both have lately increased the number of their missionaries, and extraordinary prospects are there opening to them. THE EVANGELICAL DEACONESSES of Kaiserswerth, Prussia, have now four establishments in the East, at Constantinople, Jerusalem, Smyrna, and Alexandria. Their school at Smyrna is nearly self-supporting; their hospital in Constantinople is supported by the German Benevolent Society of that city, and the other two establishments by voluntary contributions, mostly collected in Russia.

ART. XI.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES.

I.—*American Quarterly Reviews.*

- I. THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1859.—1. Natural Intimations of a Future Life: 2. Proverbs: 3. Recent German Apologetics: 4. On the Authorized Version of the New Testament: 5. Miscellaneous—Slight Foot-prints of Good Men; Bishop White on Episcopacy and the Succession.
- II. THE AMERICAN QUARTERLY CHURCH REVIEW, AND ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER, January, 1859.—1. The American Union; its Nature and Origin: 2. Theodore Parker and the Newest Theology: 3. Parton's Aaron Burr, dissected by a Nonagenarian: 4. Church Universities: 5. St. Patrick no Romanist: 6. The New Liturgy in Harvard University: 7. Letter to the Editor—Bishops, Successors of the Apostles: 8. A Word for our Fathers, in a Letter to an English Layman: American Ecclesiastical History—Early Journals of General Conventions.
- III. THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, January, 1859.—1. Canonical Compurgation and the Wager of Battle: 2. The Mount Vernon Memorial: 3. Edmund Burke: 4. Life and Writings of De Quincey: 5. Abelard: 6. Thompson's History of Boston: 7. Bible Revision: 8. Cotemporary French Literature: 9. Thompson's Life of Stoddard: 10. White's Shakspeare.

- IV. THE EVANGELICAL REVIEW, January, 1859.—1. The New Testament Bishop a Teacher: 2. The Sabbath: 3. A Want in the Lutheran Church met by the Founding of the Missionary Institute: 4. Is it right to Baptize the Children of Parents not in Connection with any Christian Society? 5. The Relation of the Family to the Church: 6. Baccalaureate Address: 7. Reminiscences of Lutheran Clergymen: 8. What is the Result of Science with regard to the Primitive World?
- V. THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, January, 1859.—1. Praying and Preaching: 2. Religion in Colleges: 3. Sawyer's New Testament: 4. The Book of Hosea: 5. The Unity of Mankind.
- VI. THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW, January, 1859.—1. The Evangelical Armenians of Turkey, the Reformers of the East: 2. Angels: 3. Longfellow as a Poet: 4. The Domestic Constitution: 5. The Heathen Witnesses of the Progress of Christianity before 200 A.D.: 6. Harrison on Greek Prepositions: 7. The Baptism of Basil the Great—Was it in his Infancy? 8. Buckle's History of Civilization: 9. Early German Philosophers.
- VII. UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY AND GENERAL REVIEW, January, 1859.—1. Enthusiasm—Its Nature and Conditions: 2. Truth, as a Dogma and as a Principle: 3. Our Helps and Hindrances: 4. Mohammedanism and its Founder: 5. The Aggressive Spirit of Christianity: 6. Divine Sovereignty: 7. Clapp's Theological Views.
- VIII. THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1859.—1. Re-union of the Synods of New York and Philadelphia: 2. The Publication Cause: 3. The New England Theocracy: 4. Foundation of Faith in the Word of God: 5. The Revival.
- IX. THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, January, 1859.—1. The Astronomical Argument against Christianity: 2. The Statesman: 3. The Fullness of Time: 4. Morality of the Legal Profession: 5. The Support of Superannuated Ministers, and the Indigent Families of Deceased Ministers: 6. The Prophetic Period of 1260 years: 7. The Early Presbyterian Immigration into South Carolina.
- X. THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, January, 1859.—1. The Moravian Brethren: 2. Francis Quarles: 3. Imagination in Theology: 4. Carlyle's Frederic: 5. The Two Religions: 6. Dr. Furness and Dr. Bushnell—A Question of Words and Names.
- XI. THE THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL, January, 1859.—1. Dr. Hickok's Rational Cosmology: 2. Notes on Scripture—Matthew xiv, xvii: 3. Haven's Mental Philosophy: 4. Religious Lessons of the Deluge: 5. The Miracle, the Discourse, and the Persecution—Acts iii and iv: 6. The Formularies of the Church of Holland.
- XII. BROWNSON'S QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1859.—1. Usury Laws: 2. Catholicity and Civilization: 3. The Humanists: 4. Primitive Elements of Thought: 5. Conversations on Theocracy: 6. Popular Amusements.
- XIII. THE NEW ENGLANDER, February, 1859.—1. The True Style and Measure of the Higher Education: 2. The New Andover Hymn Book: 3. Roman Catholic Contributions and Missions: 4. China and the Chinese: 5. Revision of the English Bible: 6. Dr. Cleveland's Reply to the New Englander: 7. Palestine a Perpetual Witness for the Bible: 8. Nature and the Supernatural.
- XIV. THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW, January, 1859.—1. The Synod at Frederick, Md.: 2. The Heidelberg Catechism—Its Formation and First Introduction in the Palatinate: 3. The Human Body and Disease, considered from the Christian Stand-point: 4. Introduction to the Study of Philosophy: 5. The Office of Bishop: 6. The Palatinate—A Historico-Geographical Sketch.

- XV. THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY, January, 1859.—1. Thomas Prince: 2. Congregationalism—its Features and Superiorities: 3. The Massachusetts General Association: 4. A Lesson from the Past: 5. The American Congregational Union: 6. Father Sawyer—A Biographical Sketch: 7. The Office of Deacon: 8. The Congregational Library Association: 9. John Norton's "Orthodox Evangelist:" 10. American Congregational Statistics, for 1858.

II.—Foreign Reviews.

- I. THE LONDON REVIEW, (Wesleyan,) January, 1859.—1. Early Christian Monachism: 2. Scotch University Reform: 3. Memoirs of Saint Simon: 4. Comparative Literary Rank of Nations: 5. The Ministry of Life: 6. Arithmetic, Ancient and Modern: 7. Literary Skepticism: 8. Illustrated Works: 9. Christianity and Ethics: 10. Fiji.
- II. THE JOURNAL OF SACRED LITERATURE, January, 1859.—1. The Franks, and their Metropolitan: 2. Chinese: 3. Babylon and its Priest-kings: 4. Notes on John xvii: 5. Exegesis of the Book of Job: 6. *Analecta Syriaca*: 7. Analysis of the Emblems of St. John. (Rev. vii.)
- III. THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER, January, 1859.—1. Old English Chronicles: 2. Pastoral Poetry: 3. What is wanted in the Church's Missions: 4. Life of Mrs. Schimmel Penninck: 5. Inett's English Church: 6. The Bishop of St. Andrew's on the Aberdeen Appeal: 7. Anti-Confessional Agitation.
- IV. THE NATIONAL REVIEW, January, 1859.—1. Crabbe: 2. The Autobiography of Catherine II.: 3. The Results of Short Imprisonments: 4. Virgil and his Modern Critics: 5. Count Miot de Melito and the French Revolution: 6. False Morality of Lady Novelists: 7. The Religion of the Working Classes: 8. Longfellow: 9. Mansel's Limits of Religious Thought: 10. Parliamentary Reform.
- V. THE BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1859.—1. Physical and Moral Heritage: 2. Dalmatia: 3. Religious Systems—Ancient and Modern: 4. Bolingbroke: 5. Serf-emanicipation in Russia: 6. Masson's Life of Milton: 7. France and England: 8. Carlyle's Frederic the Great.
- VI. THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, January, 1859.—1. Reform of Parliament: 2. The Religious Policy of Austria: 3. The Sanitary Condition of the Army: 4. Chloroform and other Anæsthetics: 5. Spiritual Destitution in England: 6. Carlyle's History of Friedrich the Second: 7. Recent Cases of Witchcraft.
- VII. THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, January, 1859.—1. Friar Bacon and Lord Bacon: 2. Dr. Pusey on the Election of Bishops: 3. John Wycliffe—His Writings, Opinions, and Influence: 4. Spiritual Discipline of the Jesuits: 5. The Religious Awakening of 1858: 6. The Codex Vaticanus and Biblical Criticism: 7. Professor Stuart and Mr. Barnes on Romans v. 12–19: 8. Lives of Ursinus and Olevianus, and the Reformation in the Palatinate.
- VIII. REVUE DES DEUX MONDES, Nineteenth Volume. Paris. January, 1859.—1. Religious Controversies in England—F. Newman, J. Martineau, W. Greg, The Evangelical Alliance. By Charles De Rémusat, of the French Academy: 2. Recollections of the Court of Dresden—Mlle. De Ha ingen. By Madame Dora d'Istna: 3. Byron, Shelly, and English Literature—A Review of the Last Days of Shelly and Byron, by E. Trelawney. By Edmond de Guerle: 4. The Europeans in Oceania—Australia Colonized and Savage. By Alfred Jacobs: 5. Marguerite de Tanly. By Amédée Achard: 6. Representative Monarchy in Italy—King Charles Albert and Count Cæsar Balbo. By Albert Blanc: 7. Scientific History in the Nineteenth Century—M. Biot. By Auguste Langel: 8. Poetry—Maritima. By J. Autran: 9. Political and Literary Record of the fortnight: 10. Musical Review: 11. Bibliographic Bulletin.

IX THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN.—Herausgegeben von D. C. Ullmann und D. F. W. C. Umbreit. Jahrgang, 1859, erstes Heft. Gotha, bei Friedrich Andreas Perthes. *Treatises*.—1. A Theological View of Capital Punishment. By Mehring. 2. An Exegetical and Doctrinal Elucidation of 2 Corinthians iii, 17: "The Lord is that Spirit." By Krummel. *Thoughts and Observations*.—1. Kamphausen's "Observations on the Tabernacle." By Fries. 2. Supplementary Observations on the Tabernacle. By Kamphausen. 3. Another Word on James iv, 5, 6. By Köster. *Reviews*.—Ritschl on the Origin of the Early Catholic Church. Reviewed by Weiss. *Miscellany*.—Programme of the Society at the Hague for the Defense of the Christian Religion.

The article on Capital Punishment is clear, pointed, and logical. It is a subject which for many years has been a Gordian knot to the prominent Christian nations. In our own country, as well as in England and Germany, capital punishment has been more unfrequent of late. Prelate Mehring takes the ground that it is wrong, and he argues his point with earnestness and ability. The passage that is most commonly cited in its defense is Genesis ix, 6. This is discussed exegetically, and the conclusion is arrived at that it is not strictly a command. Ezekiel xxxiii, 11, is referred to this life, as is the case in the preceding verse. The main argument advanced is, capital punishment is contrary to the *spirit of the Gospel*. This vein runs through the entire article. Capital punishment has been advocated on three grounds, namely: justice, expiation of crime, and punishment of the criminal. These are all discussed from a Bible standpoint. Most pains have been taken, however, in elucidating the first. This we consider the *gem* of the treatise. The aim of justice is not merely negative, but positive. Divine justice is not alone contented to deny injustice, which is the disturbance of divine order, but aims at maintaining that divine order. Plato thus understood it, and Rothe, in his *Ethik*, affirms that it is "a half and poor justice which strives after nothing further than cooling the spirit by penal retribution." But Rothe, in the subsequent part of his work, is a warm defender of capital punishment. The whole revelation of God is one of justice. Now were justice merely negative, then has the world's history been much too long. Yea, it would have closed long before the time of Christ. The object of Christ's coming was to bring man back again to his God: I am the bread of *life*, I am the resurrection and the life. It has therefore been God's wish not only that something should not take place, but, besides this, that something should happen for man's good. Not death, but life is the ultimate aim of justice; here lies the deep secret of *satisfactio vicaria*.

The article on *The Lord is that Spirit*, is a good elucidation of that much disputed passage. It embraces sixty-one pages, which, with all deference, we think could have been condensed into twenty-five. It is the most learned paper in this number of the *Studien und Kritiken*, and displays an acquaintance with Church doctrine and authorities that commands the attention to the very last. Every part beams with erudition and research, but of originality we can scarcely detect a trace. In the early part of the chapter, 2 Corinthians iii, St. Paul speaks of Moses and the Old Testament. Moses was the mediator there as Christ was in the New Testament dispensation. God manifested his will to him in the law written on tables of stone. The essence of the Old Testament is understood by the word *γράμμα*, *letter*; while that of the New

Testament is implied in *πνεῦμα*, spirit. *Πνεῦμα* is from *πνέω*, and signifies a *blowing*, a *breath*. St. Paul, therefore, supposes the new dispensation to be introduced by a person who breathes out the spirit of God in every step of his life. *The Lord is that spirit*: ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστίν. It was the opinion of Chrysostom, and many others since his time, that *the Lord* is the predicate, but the connection of this with the preceding verse precludes such a view. The writer opposes every explanation which divests the three words, *Lord*, *is*, and *spirit*, of their solemn meaning. Mosheim, Bolten, Billroth, and others, suppose *the Lord* to be the doctrine of Christ; the essence of Christianity is the *spirit* of Christ. Wetstein explains the passage thus: The *Lord signifies* that spirit; but *ἐστίν* has no such meaning either here or in Luke xxii, 19. Others have held another meaning: The *Lord communicates* that spirit. Erasmus and Calvin: *That spirit* is the spirit of the law which first became *viva* or *vivifica*, when inspired by Christ, through whom the spirit comes to the body. Likewise Olshausen: The *Lord* is that spirit spoken of in verse 6. The writer identifies *the Lord* and *spirit*, and argues that St. John does so in his Gospel, and Paul in many places. Compare Romans viii, 9, which is *but an e pluribus unum*. The three modes of explaining this passage before the eighteenth century may be classified under three heads: The *Church traditional*, which holds that *that spirit* is the subject, thereby proving the divinity of the Holy Spirit. This view is obsolete. The second explanation is the one marked out by Origen, and afterward followed by Erasmus, and defended by Calvin: *The Lord* is the subject; *the spirit* is that through which the law becomes vital and efficient in us. The third is that of the Arians, of lowering the divinity of Christ because the word *κύριος* and not *θεός* is employed. It errs, too, in making *that spirit* only a signification of the essence and not of the grace of Christ, thus making this passage parallel with John iv, 24, just as if the *spirit* were without the article. Baur maintains this view, and his opinions are discussed at length.

It gives us pleasure to read such a review as Professor Weiss has written on Ritschl's work on the origin of the early Catholic Church, a book written in reply to the attacks of the Tübingen school on the evangelical view of the early history of Christianity. Since the relations of Christianity to the Mosaic law caused so many discussions in the first century of the Christian era, our author considers them at length. His conclusions are these: Neither did Christ abolish circumcision or the privileges of the Jewish people, nor did his disciples cease to observe the Mosaic manner of worship. Christ embraced the law of love to God and man as the principle of the Old Testament law, and what does not correspond, or is involved in this principle, Christ considered of no value. But the perfecting of the Christian law, as the weaning of his disciples from the worship of their fathers, Christ left for future development and to the guidance of the Spirit. The reviewer thinks that the author's epitome and representation of St. Paul's system contain the best views ever advanced on the subject. Essenism was a society of priests, formed on the basis of a universal right of priesthood. This view Professor Weiss holds on the ground of their holy supper, lustrations, and their white linen clothing; but still he allows them to have appropriated certain heathen elements. A prominent

division in the work reviewed is, "Catholicism of the great anti-Gnostic Church." Here are shown the deviations of Romanism from the doctrines of St. Paul; this is at the bottom of all their misconceptions and deformities. The work closes with a view of the development of the episcopacy and a description of monasticism. Ritschl's book denotes a strong tendency in Germany in the right direction. It has been the especial aim of Rationalism to subvert the evangelical view of the early planting of Christianity. This has been bravely resisted, and we are glad to find that Neander has left those behind him who are willing and able to defend the cause which he loved so much.

This number of the *Studien und Kritiken* is one of no little value. Some of its articles abound in bold and original views, while others bear traces of the most laborious study and research. It is heartily gratifying to every lover of Scriptural religion to observe the tone which pervades its pages. It is one sign, and no mean one, that the clouds which have for a hundred years been lowering over the Protestant German Church, are breaking away and giving place to the pure light of Gospel truth. Theological magazines are the tide-gauges that denote the rise and fall of the religious current in every land.

Apròpos of the everywhere-talked-of question of baptism, we have thought it worth while to epitomize for the Quarterly an article in a back number of *Studien und Kritiken*, by Pastor Laufs. Baptism, says he, was not a movement proceeding from Christ, but one toward him. Christ gave no especial instructions to his disciples as to how they should act in regard to baptism after his death, as indeed he did not on any other subject. The apostles understood baptism to be a pledge to God to be useful in the spread of the Gospel. It was not passive, then, but active. In apostolical days there was no established custom in regard to baptism. Converted and unconverted persons were baptized; and the doctrine of the Baptists, that only those who had been born again should be baptized, never came into use before the second half of the apostolical age. When Philip went through Samaria he baptized many persons, though many of them did not receive the Holy Spirit until some time afterward, at the laying on of the hands of the apostles. The strongest point which the author makes is on infant baptism. This has always been a great means of strengthening and enlarging the Christian Church. Martensen maintains that infants were not baptized originally, but that they have a right to know it now. Zwingli went on the supposition that the children are God's, they belong to God's people, therefore they are entitled to a pledge of unity with God. Baptism takes the place of circumcision, and if the children are not God's, then would Christ have less power than Moses. The children are God's, *in dubio*, until they prove to the contrary. Augustine baptized children because they have original sin, and are freed from it through this sacrament. Zwingli says it is good that children be recognized by the Church, as those who wish God to be their God. The paper closes with an exegetical notice of the Greek passages on baptism found in the Acts of the Apostles. The Socinians maintain that βαπτίζοντες is a mere figure of speech, similar to the Latin *imbuere*. Hence the dictum of Socinus: *Etsi is ritus (that is Johannis) ab apostolis in ecclesiæ initus servatus fuit, cum sc. evangelicæ disciplinæ adhuc rudes erant homines*. The author fears much from the grow-

ing prevalence of this Socinian view. Just at this time baptism is exciting no little attention in our own Church as well as in Germany. It is to be hoped, however, that the agitation of the subject may contribute to a more general and Scriptural understanding of it, instead of involving it in darkness and unsettling the minds of the unwary.

We have in the same *Hef* an instructive paper on the chronology of the Acts of the Apostles. The first part of it is an inquiry into the governorship of Felix, while the last is an excellent sketch of Paul's missionary travels, together with names and dates. We subjoin an extract from it:

U. C.	A. D.	PAUL'S LABORS.
797	44	Paul and Barnabas in Jerusalem. Return to Antioch.
798	45	Paul and Barnabas enter upon their first missionary tour, Cyprus, Pamphylia, Antiochia ad Pisidiam.
799	46	Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, then return to Antioch.
800	47	Apostles' Meeting in Jerusalem.
801	48	Second missionary journey, Syria, Cilicia, Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, Phrygia, Galatia.
802	49	Macedonia, Greece. Return to Corinth in autumn.
803	50	Paul in Corinth.
804	51	Paul leaves Corinth, and goes by way of Jericho to Antioch.
805	52	Paul's third missionary journey, Syria, Cilicia, Galatia, Phrygia, and arrives at Ephesus in the autumn.
807	54	Paul in Ephesus.
808	55	Paul goes from Ephesus to Macedonia and Greece, where he remains during the winter.
809	56	Paul goes from Greece, through Macedonia, to Jerusalem, where he is taken prisoner at the feast of Pentecost.
810	57	Paul in Cæsarea.
811	58	Paul in Cæsarea; the transactions of Festus.
812	59	Paul comes in the spring to Rome.
813	60	} Paul's two years' stay in Rome.
814	61	

ART. XII.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

It is of greatest concernment in the Church and Commonwealth to have a vigilant eye how books demean themselves as well as men, and thereafter to confine, imprison, and do sharpest justice on them as malefactors; for books are not absolutely dead things, but do contain a potency of life in them to be as active as that soul was whose progeny they are.—MILTON.

I.—Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

(1.) "*A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Philippians.* By JOHN EADIE, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature to the United Presbyterian Church." (8vo., pp. 297. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1859.) Dr. Eadie, of Glasgow, is sending forth to the world a series of commentaries on the Epistles of Paul, of which this is the first that has come under our notice. The Carters announce the volume on

Ephesians as in press, and that on Galatians as in preparation. Judging from the specimen upon our critical table, they are to be among the most valuable contributions to exegetic literature in the English language. Indeed, the hand that produced this volume will never afford to publish anything secondary in that department.

As stated in the title, the comment is directly upon the Greek text, assuming in the reader some mastery of the original language. The author professes (and displays what he professes) a familiarity, from long and intimate acquaintance, with the character both of the apostle's Greek and of his method. He discusses, with trained acuteness, the true text. His reading of commentators, ancient and modern, especially the German, is extensive. In his style, in contrast with his German rivals, he is eminently clear, somewhat antithetical, grasping nice meanings in phrases of neat precision, and often eloquent. He possesses the religious depth of old Scotland, united with something of the stirring ardor of modern religious movement. He is *soundly* Calvinistic, but not obtrusively. In his exegesis, for instance, on Phil. ii, 13, he makes the inworking of God not merely produce the *power* of our holy willing, but *shape* the volition. This he holds to be consistent with the *freedom* of the will, because thereby no violence is done to the voluntary nature; on the contrary, it precisely accords with our voluntary nature, for our volitions are always shaped by an omnipotent creation. And as the process is thus normal and ordinary, and not *forced* or *driven*, the man, in *exercising* the volition which God *shapes*, is *free*. To be volitionally free, therefore, is to be caused to choose, in the ordinary course of nature. And this accords with the fine old Calvinian view, which affirms that as the intellect does freely conclude, according to a mathematical demonstration, which necessarily determines it, so the will is free whenever it chooses according to the motive which naturally and necessarily determines it. *Volition is thus no more free than intellection, both being necessitated, but necessitated not violently or forcefully, but normally and naturally.*

Mr. Eadie pleases us better than our German friends for another reason. The German is run away with by the analytical. To avoid the being governed by the spirit of system, he is lax and wayward, if not, on the whole, inconsistent; scarcely knowing at the commencement, often, where he is to land in the conclusion. In his own mind, at any rate, Mr. Eadie has his synthesis fixed; and thus his analysis is never meandering or diffuse, but, while free and exhaustive, is regulated and synoptical.

The thanks of biblical scholars are due to the Carters for the prompt issue of this valuable series; which it is to be hoped the author will prosecute through the entire series of the apostle's productions.

(2.) *Selections from the Writings of Fenelon; with a Memoir of his Life.* By Mrs. FOLLEN. New edition." (12mo., pp. 374. Boston and Cambridge: James Munroe & Co. 1859.) This work is the production of the accomplished widow of the late Dr. Follen, who, though theoretically a rationalist of the most unequivocal stamp, impressed his friends with reverence for his pure piety. We have indeed in this volume the special phenom-

enon of a work of exalted piety, written by a Romanist, translated by a Unitarian, and presented acceptably to the heart of the evangelical Church. It offers a problem which it is unnecessary for us to attempt either any theoretical solution as to the whole, or any practical solution as to individual cases. We can leave to the omniscient Heart-searcher to decide how far theoretical error, vincible or invincible, may be blended with that state of will or affections which Infinite Mercy will accept. We cannot presume to gauge how the "spirit of faith," and "the heart of faith," may exist in spite of the failure of the understanding. Thus far we know, that without faith it is impossible to please God, and that the true object of faith, which alone we can present for salvation, is Jesus Christ and him crucified.

Fenelon belonged, with Leighton, Fletcher, and Edwards, to that order of piety—the order of St. John—which lies deeply in the subjective, and borders upon mysticism; and which stands in contrast, though not in opposition, to that of Howard, Wilberforce, and Asbury. Paul and Wesley blended both the subjective and the active. Subjective writers of the Fenelon school are sometimes somewhat one-sided, and productive of danger to a certain class of minds; a class which is prone to a strong affinity for them; a class which loves the indulgence of religious emotion as a sort of spiritual luxury, and in whose minds it dwells, a sanctified revery, productive more of inordinate self-confidence than of any external fruits of religious consistency and beauty, or well-directed activity. Yet such writers have their own great value to check the too strong tendency to the merely external, and to draw an objective age into deep self-searching. To such writers the actors in the great field of Christian enterprise should ever resort as fountains of clearness and spiritual refreshment, in whose transparent mirror they may scrutinize the purity of their springs of action, and from whose freshness they may draw renewed strength for the race of holy well-doing.

Let us accept Fenelon as a cheering proof and reminder that even in the bosom of Romanism there may exist a saint of the true stamp, needing no papal canonization. This need check no earnestness for truth, no dread of error. The fact that piety may exist in spite of error does not contradict the fact that moral error destroys its millions, and that truth, pure truth, and the purer the better, is the great instrument for a world's salvation. But where, in the midst of surrounding gloom, a light like Fenelon's shines out, let us not refuse to love its glow or accept its guidance; but render thanks to God for such omens that the condition of the world is not as bad as total darkness.

(3.) "*The State of the Impenitent Dead.* By ALVEH HOVEY, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Newton Theological Institution." (18mo., pp. 168. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 59 Washington-street. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman, & Co. Cincinnati: George Blanchard.) Professor Hovey's brief treatise is considerably less generic than its title. It is a vigorous and compact essay, embracing both the rational and Scriptural argument against the theory of Annihilationism, especially as held by Ham and Hudson. It was originally prepared and read before a conference of his brethren in the ministry, and is now published at their unanimous request.

Professor Hovey first establishes, as propositions concerning the soul, that the Scriptures recognize an original and important difference between the soul of man and his body; that this original difference essentially underlies an adaptation to different durations; and that the soul possesses qualities specifically adapted for endless existence. On this last point the professor makes the following suggestive remarks:

"We do not hesitate to trace all the fatigue which results from intense and protracted thought to the material organ of the mind. Our best intellectual processes never flag until the brain begins to suffer."

On the basis of these three propositions the professor prepared to construct a Scripture argument. He shows the nature of the original death penalty, and its antithetic life. Of his soul, in its own nature indestructible, death is by necessity a condition of continued existence. He next investigates, from Scripture and reason, the nature of the intermediate state, and demonstrates its consciousness from the words of Christ and his apostles. He next investigates the history of opinions in the time of the Saviour. He then examines the theories, and meets the various objections, Biblical and rational, against the doctrine of conscious eternal punishment.

Had Professor Hovey treated this subject in a full and exhaustive extent, the talent and learning of the present essay show him fully competent to the production of a standard work upon the subject. A work of that character is still a desideratum, which, we are happy to say, will soon be furnished by the press of Carlton & Porter.

(4.) "*Practical Sermons*. By NATHANIEL W. TAYLOR, D.D., late Dwight Professor of Didactic Theology in Yale College." (8vo., pp. 455. New York: Clark, Austin, & Smith. 1858.) The genius of Dr. Taylor, his high position as Yale Professor of Divinity, and his leadership of a new movement in the theology of his denomination, conspired to render his name somewhat celebrated in our country. *New Divinity* and *Taylorism* were, not many years since, ordinary theological technics. To some men there is a temptation in the notoriety won by the heresiarch; but Dr. Taylor evidently thought with a spirit of independent integrity, and he ventured upon innovations from a real difficulty in accepting old Calvinism, and a real sense that the spirit of the age demanded modifications. No one can read these faithful and searching sermons without feeling that the author feared God, and desired to fill men with that fear, that he might lead them to repentance and holy life. Sin, death, and hell, on one side, and repentance, faith, and eternal life, through Jesus Christ, are the topics upon which, in a spirit of solemn reverence, he ever dwells.

Dr. Taylor does not run his trains of thought through the details of ordinary life. His sayings do not reach you like a sudden reminder in some detail of business or social intercourse. On the contrary, they dwell within the domain of theology, and bring Scripture science to bear upon the great points of conversion from sin, and submission of entire life to God. They assume that if you are truly penitent and truly changed in heart, the details of holy living will all come right. They could not have been heard, they

cannot be read, without impressing the mind with the power of these great themes.

We have received from Clark, Austin, & Smith, two stately volumes on Moral Government, the great subject of Dr. Taylor's life's study; but as these require a more extended examination than we can now command, we shall reserve them for a farther review.

(5.) "*Hermeneutical Manual*; or, Introduction to the Exegetical Study of the Scriptures of the New Testament. By PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D., Principal and Professor of Divinity in the Free Church College, Glasgow." (8vo., pp. 859. Philadelphia: Smith, English, & Co. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman, & Co. 1859.) Dr. Fairbairn is favorably known in this country by his work on the Typology of Scripture, a volume published some time since by the Carters, in which, with no little originality of view and accuracy of logic, the writer rescued the types of Scripture at once from the extravagance of the spiritualizers, and the scorn of Rationalists, and restored them to their proper place as possessed of a character at once truly spiritual and truly rational. The present is a more miscellaneous work, yet divisible into a few generic subjects. In style, both of mind and language, it strongly reminds us of the Biblical dissertations of another celebrated Scotch theologian, Dr. Campbell.

The work is divided into three parts. The first part discusses the Greek of the New Testament as a matter of idiom and style. The second contains dissertations on particular subjects connected with New Testament exegesis. Among these subjects, Christ's two genealogies; Angelology; the titles Christos and Son of Man; the antagonistic titles, Antichrist, etc; Baptizo, Hades, Διαθήκη, μετάνοια, παλιγγενεσία, ανακαίνωσις, αποκατάστασις, and others. Part third, New Testament quotations from the Old Testament.

The lovers of Biblical literature will find a rich treat in these pages.

(6.) "*The Evening of Life*; or, Light and Comfort amid the Shadows of Declining Years. By Rev. JEREMIAH CHAPLIN, D.D. A new edition, revised and much enlarged." (12mo., pp. 281. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard. 1859.) "It may be proper to add that this volume has been so prepared that it may be hailed as a friend in the family of any Christian denomination." So says Dr. Chaplin in his preface. But it is a curious fact that while his book is made of extracts from near two hundred and fifty authors, not one of them is Methodistic—unless we except the Bible. This might not be marked as anything special, did not the above sentence indicate that the matter of denominationalism was present to his view. And such being the fact, we may say that the volume has not the slightest right to expect any welcome among the millions of Methodist families in America or Europe.

Nevertheless, denominationalism apart, the book is a good book. It is a charming volume to read when the shadows of life grow solemn and expansive around us. To us, Cicero on Old Age is one of the best remnants of classical antiquity; and, pagan as he is, we have expected, if permitted to

walk pensively down the vale of the evening of life, to take his words of wisdom in our hand among the aids enabling us to walk cheerfully, and with conscious self-possession. From a wide range of Christian literature, Dr. Chaplin has culled a wreath to wind around the staff of age, containing brighter thoughts and firmer faith than were vouchsafed the noble Roman.

(7.) "*The Extent of the Atonement, in its relations to God and the Universe.* By the Rev. THOMAS W. JENKYN, D.D., late President of Coward College, London. Third edition, carefully revised by the Author for the American edition." (12mo., pp. 376. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman, & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard. 1859.) The former edition of this work, published some years since in this country, was well received by the Christian public; and by a large amount of the evangelical Church of our country was accepted as a standard. It is marked by eminent ability. It elucidates the principles upon which atonement can be defended, as against skeptics, with much clearness. It is very decided against what is sometimes called the *commercial* view of the atonement; and considers the sufferings of Christ as a visible exhibit of God's regard for his law, so that consequently, upon such a manifestation, the sinner may be safely pardoned.

He defends the *universality* of the atonement; herein standing at broad issue with the able work of Symington on the same subject. We fully agree with cotemporary Reviews on the Calvinistic side of the question, that from the premises in common assumed by the two, Symington is by far the more logical reasoner. Jenkyn and all other believers in predestinarian reprobation, maintain a universal atonement only by being inconsequent logicians.

(8.) "*Salvation by Christ; a Series of Discourses on some of the most important Doctrines of the Gospel.* By FRANCIS WAYLAND." (12mo., pp. 386. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman, & Co. Cincinnati: Geo. S. Blanchard. 1859.) This volume is mostly a republication of Dr. Wayland's "University Sermons;" but a number hitherto unpublished are added, and a certain system seems to be given to their arrangement as a whole. Indeed, they form a sort of body of popular divinity, though not much the less profound for being popular. The being of a God, the fall and consequent condition of our race, the preparation and coming of the Messiah, justification by faith and not by works, conversion, renewal, sanctification, the Church, and the moral duties of Christians, are the great topics developed. The last three sermons are on the relations of the Christian to the magistrate, and are a noble rebuke of the servile atheism which not long since prompted the political denial of the existence of a higher law than a mortal could enact; a denial re-echoed by a servile section of the clergy, who demonstrated that even the pulpit of this day is not free from time-servers that would readily, at the demand of corruption in power, abjure the Divine government, and perhaps deny the Divine existence.

These sermons exhibit the traits which we have already ascribed to Dr. Wayland's productions. They are solid, stately masses of fine old evangeli-

cal theology and morality; clothed in that style of pure, nervous, and most appropriate English that belongs to the best age and the purest school of our language and literature.

(9.) "*Promise of the Father*; or, a Neglected Speciality of the Latter Days. Addressed to the Clergy and Laity of all Christian Communities. By the Author of 'The Way of Holiness.'" (12mo., pp. 421. Boston: Henry V. Degen. 1859.) Mrs. Palmer has, during the last twenty years, sent forth a number of publications on the highest of all possible themes, and taking the highest ground of Christian experience. Their broadcast diffusion in England and America attests their power. Not inferior, indeed, can be that power which spreads volumes of purest piety into a breadth of circulation which none but rare minds can command, even for works which appeal to the imagination, and the universal passions of our earthly nature.

The present volume has a title which but enigmatically indicates the object of the work. Its purpose is to spread before our Christian Churches of all denominations the arguments in behalf of the exercise of female gifts in the direct promotion of the Gospel. She does not propose any introduction of woman into the pulpit. She claims no unfeminine woman's rights. She simply proposes that the mind and heart of woman may furnish their contributions for the active work of animating and edifying the heart and soul of the Church. The Christian public will give her an ample hearing.

(10.) "*Sermons for the Sick Room and Fireside*; or, a Series of Discourses on the Divine Nature, Offices, and Kingdom of Jesus. By Rev. J. R. ANDERSON." (12mo., pp. 464. Philadelphia: Perkinpine & Higgins. 1859.) It is not to be inferred from the title of Mr. Anderson's volume that the sermons are upon subjects particularly suited for invalids. They are able treatises upon great Christian doctrines. We trust that the increasing number of readers who love to include excellent sermons in their library will include this volume. Among the topics are the Incarnation of the Word, Christ as the Root of Jesse, and Christ's Transfiguration. There are several on the resurrection of Christ, and several impressive sermons on the last great transactions of the world.

(11.) "*Pleasant Pathways*; or, Persuasives to Early Piety: containing Explanations and Illustrations of the Beauty, Safety, and Pleasantness of a Religious Life: being an earnest Attempt to persuade Young People of both Sexes to seek Happiness in the Love and Service of Jesus Christ. By DANIEL WISE, author of the Path of Life," etc. (12mo., pp. 285. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1859.) Mr. Wise has become almost unrivaled among us in the art of winning a large circle of readers to the perusal of books that propose to lead them in the paths of piety and heaven. It is a blessed talent this, and well worthy to be plentifully employed, to show that wisdom's ways are pleasantness, and all her paths peace. Let parents who would have their children *love* piety, love the Church, and love God, place this incentive in their hands.

(12.) "*Illustrations of the Divine Government in Remarkable Providences.* Collected and arranged by S. HIGGINS and W. H. BRISBANE. With an Introductory Essay on Providence. By Rev. JOSEPH CASTLE, D.D." (12mo., pp. 425. Philadelphia: Perkinpine & Higgins. 1859.) This work is popular in its substance and style, and attractive to the ordinary reader as a series of extraordinary narratives. It is beneficial as a whole to the popular mind, as tending to implant decisive notions of Divine agency, and to supplant the flimsy dreams of atheism and pantheism, to which the natural heart of the moral "good" is inclined. It furnishes to the philosophical Christian many an incident to illustrate the argument on either side in regard to special providences. The introductory essay, by Dr. Castle, is worthy his able pen.

(13.) "*Now.* By NEWMAN HALL, L.L.B." (48mo., pp. 116. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1859.) The little word *Now*, which forms the very brief title of this little book, is the starting point of one of the most impressive exhibitions of the inducements to immediate repentance we have lately seen. Its mode of presenting and expressing its train of thought is unique and striking.

II.—Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

(14.) "*The Emancipation of Faith.* By HENRY EDWARD SCHEDEL, M.D., Laureate of the Hospitals at Paris; author of a Treatise on the Diseases of the Skin; a Clinical Examen of Hydropathy, etc., etc." (2 vols., 8vo. New York: D. Appleton & Co.) This work has a twofold attraction. It is the fruit of immense studies in the field of that highest thought, What do we know of God, and how do we know it? It is additionally attractive from the lamentable fate of its author: while traveling among the Alps in July, 1856, he ventured to climb alone, in the night, Mount Pilate, (ominous name for a student of such themes,) and, falling from a precipice, perished. For many years he had separated himself that he might intermeddle with all wisdom. He started as a chemist and physician; and while very young attained great eminence in these kindred pursuits at Paris, their metropolis. The above mentioned treatises are yet the great authority, in Europe and America, on the subjects they handle. Exhausting these studies, his mind craved new stimulants; and what but the strongest meat could satisfy it? A prize was offered in England for the best essay on "The Origin of Theology, including an examination into the extent to which that science concords with the divers systems of ancient and modern philosophy, to establish the basis of this alliance, and to demonstrate how the liberty of conscience in man can subsist in the midst of the moral circumstances that press upon him."

This discordant union of great themes perhaps accounts for much of the disorder that characterizes the work. Caught with the greatness of the subject, he began to prepare for the undertaking, but probably had not accomplished half of his preliminary studies before some unknown weakening bore away the honor and the purse. Born in England, of an English mother and

a German father, and brought up in Paris, he was virtually a native of the three ruling tongues of the world, and thus inherited as a birthright what but a few can ordinarily purchase, and they only at a great price—the *entree* to all the languages of civilized man. He acquired a language and its treasures in a marvelously short time. The acquisitive faculty exercised in studies, not unlike the same faculty when employed in material enterprises, is often attended with great ignorance as to the attractive way to unfold its treasures. The great student is apt to be as awkward in expression as in manners. Kant, Neander, Bentham, are eminent examples of a numerous class. Rarely do the fullest learning and the most felicitous style exist in one man. When they do, they place their possessor among the everlasting rulers of man. Schedel is of the former class. He cannot mold his gold into artistic shapes. His learning is almost *rudis indigestaque moles*. The work is therefore for scholars rather than for the people. It is not then without its uses. We need receiving as well as distributing reservoirs to convey the water of life, mental and spiritual, to every human soul. While he is thus shut off from the crowded auditory in his future, as he has been in his past, he may nevertheless rule those who rule the world. What are his prospects for this high seat?

He undertakes to answer the question, *What is the knowledge the human mind has of God, and how do we obtain it?* This great query he answers from a faithful study of the history of religion in all ages and races. He then inquires what is the relation of the human reason, the liberty of the will, the Bible, Christianity, theological and ecclesiastical ideas and forms, to this fundamental idea. The undertaking is vast, and if success is not complete, it may still be far from a failure. He declares that the human mind cannot, by any original suggestion or spontaneous impulse, nor by any fullness of reflection, attain to the knowledge of the existence or the nature of God. Hence his starting point is that *God reveals himself to man as existing* under the name of Almighty. His nature he conceals. *His existence as the inconceivable, supreme in power, wisdom, and goodness, is the sum total of our knowledge of him, and we acquire this solely by revelation.* This word he does not refer to the Bible, but to the direct inspiration of every man with this divine fact. Divine faith, he declares, is the trust which man imposes in God thus revealed. Christian faith is trust in Christ, as identical with the Almighty thus universally revealed, the revelation renewed, as he terms it, for the salvation and regeneration of man. He devotes the first half of his work to the dethroning of the positive faith, or that which gives to human reason, pure and intuitive, or logical and reflective, the power to discover the existence and nature of God. He says:

"If it be asked whether this work adopts either the *à priori* or the *à posteriori* doctrine respecting man's belief in God; that is, whether this belief be an intuition or a fruit of reflection, we reply, unhesitatingly, neither. We attempt to adduce no evidence of an existence which we deem so far above human conception. We merely adduce rational evidence of the *fact of the revelation* of the Almighty. We have collected a certain amount of evidence respecting this eventful fact, but we go no further. We agree decidedly in admitting, with the Materialist, that, without revelation, man knows of no God. We conceive him to be in the right when he maintains that neither

human intuition nor human conception can stand forth adequate to the undertaking; but we deny his conclusions when he maintains that since the notion of God is neither an intuition nor a judgment, it is therefore a fancy."

The evidence of this fact of a revelation is proved first, negatively, by an exhaustive examination of the failure of human thought in this direction. He shows how all the great thinkers, from Plato and Aristotle, through Lucretius and Cicero, to Des Cartes, Spinoza, Hobbes, Leibnitz, and their dead and living successors, have utterly failed in their attempt to scale, on the ladder of finite thought, the mount of God. After proving the incompetency of these efforts, he seeks to establish his statement as to the fact of this revelation, or the inspired illumination of the race, by an appeal to the universal language in which the idea of God is expressed. Here is another exhibition of great learning, in tracing this primitive notion through all its multitudinous forms of expression in the religious language of the world. He discovers that the root of them all is certain primal and universal syllables that express the ideas of power and unity—One Almighty Being. With these are others, expressing life or spirit, wisdom and goodness. Around these central radicals have grown up a mass of symbols and myths, that have encumbered and degraded, but not destroyed them. This innate or Divine faith is renewed in the incarnation of the Son. "This involves strict theism," he says. "The unity of the Son and Father constitutes the connection between the revelation, or communication to man of God's existence, and his revelation in Christ. The unity of the Trinity is the real test of the worth of Christianity." He then shows how trust in Christ is symmetrical with, though superior to, the natural faith of man. He denies all power in man to pierce the mystery of the incarnation, as that would involve an apprehension of the *nature* of God, which never can be known, only his existence under certain names being revealed. We must trust in Christ as the one who never heard of Christ trusts in God; only with greater clearness as to our needs and his power, and a greater consciousness of the exercise of that power to relieve our wants and woes, as becomes the superiority of this revelation.

The office of reason in respect to these matters of faith is well set forth. "Rational evidence," he says, "can never rise above the level of human reason, whose highest point is intuitive belief in *relative* existence." Hence it can never find out of itself the absolute and infinite, but must take these as a revelation made not to reason but to faith. Divine faith depends on the fact of Divine revelation. Reason can ascertain whether that fact be revealed, whether it is universally impressed on the soul. When it has done that, it must stand reverently at the feet of the great revelation, and follow the orders of its vicegerent, faith. He thus crushes two errors with one blow—local faiths and conceptions taken for universal, as Spiritualism, Mormonism, Romanism, the *sensus communis*, or universal sense, being the only basis on which any claim can be established; and the infidel chatterings of Newman, and Parker, and Emerson, and their German progenitors, about "the absolute," as discoverable by the reason, and their freedom, therefore, from all revelations, especially that made in Christ. Reason is thus made the body-guard of faith, as stalwart warriors of their king, who rules serene, by

right Divine, as well these, his highest officers, as the lowest menials of his realm.

This is his Emancipation of Faith; a deliverance of the original and renewed revelation made to every man from all theologic, and philosophic, and ecclesiastic formula, and the placing of it, solitary and sublime, before every eye. He is exceedingly bitter against theology, or the science of God. The lash if not undeserved, is administered without due discrimination. We must, it seems, abandon all attempts to construct such a science, and take the simple lights hung in the firmament of revelation as our guides, without hope or desire to scientifically *understand* and classify them. The word *theology*, is faulty; the idea it embodies is blasphemy, not yet accounted sin, because of our ignorance, but certain to become so felt and feared in the advancing faith of the Church. We are to infer that much of the labored argumentation of the fathers about the revealed attributes of God is folly, greater than it would be to waste reams to prove that the sun had the attributes of light and heat. Much of it is worse than folly, because it attempts to explore the depths of the Divine nature and working, never revealed, and hence never within the reach of the reason. Such are discourses on the *rationale* of the Trinity, the incarnation, the atonement, etc. Hence religion, so far as it is a science, or intellectual system, woven by the reason, must be merely a system of proofs of the existence of these facts from the Scriptures, and their harmony with the moral nature and needs of humanity.

He advocates a National Church as the proper embodiment of this universal faith, and declares that the lack of it in America will yet require the English monarch to interfere for our salvation. He fails to see how his universal revelation renewed in Christ must subdue all reason and faith, however hostile the life may yet remain, not by the arm of the state, but by the arm of the Almighty; and a universal faith may exist, not as the servant, but sovereign of the state; not in uniform modes of worship and ecclesiastical machinery, but as life, vegetable, animal, or spiritual, an omnipotent unit in infinitely diversified manifestations.

We consider the work to be an able, but not entirely safe, contribution to the literature of religion. Though excluded from the popular favor by its style as well as subject it will not be without its influence on our most active thinkers upon the subject which dwarfs all surrounding themes as an Alp its shrubs—the study of God as related to man, and of man as related to God.

H.

(15.) "*Rational Cosmology*; or, the Eternal Principles and the Necessary Laws of the Universe. By LAURENS P. HICKOK, D.D., Union College." (New York: D. Appleton & Co. London: 16 Little Britain. 1858.) This work of Dr. Hickok, like his *Rational Psychology*, is a marvelous product of abstruse thought, without a parallel in the English language in the department of metaphysics. It is generally clear and often eloquent in its style, and yet such is the remoteness of the range of argument from common thinking, that language seems incompetent to convey the thought, and the reader struggles to get at the meaning, and often finds himself baffled, until

after he has made several vigorous endeavors. But in the end he will find there is a meaning, and it abundantly rewards his exertions; for though it may not always secure conviction, it will give pleasure to the imagination. The object of the work is to attain to the ideal of the Creator in the universe by developing the principles which must have originated the facts of the universe, and then from the facts and their laws, as they are cognized by us, gaining a confirmation of these principles; which procedure, though it may not fully attain to a discovery of the Divine idea in creation, will clear the way to it, and be in itself, as far as it goes, a true rational cosmology. Before entering into the proposed disquisition, he glances at the history of philosophy in relation to cosmology, beginning with the Ionic school, and passing on to Plato, who attained to the idea of an absolute, personal God, who originated the universe, according to principles and ideas, or archetypes in his own mind; and also to the conception of a true cosmology, by accounting for facts from the eternal principles, though his apprehension of principles was imperfect, and often erroneous, and his application of them to facts was very superficial in consequence of his want of information respecting facts. Having, through the reason, arrived at the knowledge of an absolute Creator, our author proceeds to inquire how a world must be created, if it be created, and thus gains an insight into the eternal principles; and finally, the facts of creation are taken to detect their laws, and these laws are shown to be the necessary determination of the eternal principles. Thus in both surveys these principles are brought out clearly to view, and we shall find in them, or suggested by them, the Divine ideal of creation.

As a specimen of the book, take the elucidation of the eternal principles that determine matter. What is matter? Is it inertia? No! for it would then fail to reveal itself to the senses. It must have force to become known. If there be force there, then the inert mass is superfluous. Let it drop, consider it as not being, and you have force left. That force is matter, the whole of matter, and not merely something put into matter. But let the book speak:

"We must therefore wholly renounce such a conception of matter, for indeed, upon rational examination, it will be found to be an impossible conception, a mere negation in thought. Let us, however, keep this *force*, which we have supposed to be supplied to matter, carefully subjected to a rational insight, and determine whether this force, that does all that is done, is not matter itself. Simple activity is spiritual activity, and has nothing in it that can awake the thought of force; and it is only as it meets some opposing action, and encounters an antagonist, that we can have the notion of force." "Conceive of two simple activities meeting each other and reciprocally, holding back, or resting against each other, and thus of the two making a third thing at the limit of meeting, which is unlike to either. In neither of the two activities can there be the notion of force, but at the point of antagonism force is generated, and one new thing comes from the synthesis of the two activities. To distinguish this from the other forces hereafter found, we call it antagonistic force. In this position is taken, and there is more than the idea of *being*, which the simple activities each have; there is being standing out, an existence; being *in re*, *reality*, a *thing*." (P. 93.)

So much for the constitution of matter, considered merely as substantial matter; it is not *inertia*, but a *vis inertia*. To make the varied attributes

of matter, other activities or movements of spiritual agency are to be conceived. Matter then is nothing but the forces generated by the various movements of spiritual activities.

So much for the constitution of matter. How was it created? His account of creation will explain what has seemed obscure in the exposition of the constitution of matter:

"The axiom, 'Out of nothing, nothing comes,' is to be taken as universally conclusive. There can be no creation without a Creator." "With the distinct conception of force as the essence of all material being clearly in mind, we seek to apprehend how, where force is not, it may begin to be." With all rational spirits there is a capacity of initial causality, and thus of all free and responsible beings, we affirm that their personal acts are their own origination, and can no more be transferred to any other person than their separate identity. Men and angels can in this sense truly originate." "But man cannot create new forces, and thus man cannot create matter. He is himself incarnate, utterly merged in matter, and can thus put out no act that shall immediately meet another act in counteraction, but his every act of energizing must first encounter the forces in which he is incorporated. This activity meets forces, and moves matter already created; but his activity cannot, with nothing between, meet itself in counteraction and take a new position, and thus begin a new space-filling operation. Yea, if we mean to conceive of angels as pure spirits, activities without corporiety, and thus competent to make one act counteract and hold another in position, yet these counteractivities could only be within their own subjective spheres." "But with the conception of a Supreme Absolute Mind, all these difficulties are excluded. He can begin action, and he can put action in counteragency, with no forces intervening, and whatever position he may thus take and hold by permanent forces, *though subjective to himself, or within his own spheres of agency*, they may be objective to all other being, for all being will be alike subjective to him in whom all live, and move, and have their being."

Is not this bordering hard on Pantheism? The material world is nothing but the activities of the absolute Spirit moving in different directions in space. You think you tread upon solid ground; but the earth around you and the heavens above you are only a spiritual theater, made by actions and counteractions of Divine volitions. And all this you must conclude, because "from nothing nothing can come;" and as God is not matter, as men commonly understand matter, but pure spirit, all that proceeds from him must be spirit, or the movements of spirit.

This is a splendid theory to be sure, but many will prefer the old notion, that at God's command matter, in all its inert form and active properties, sprang out of nothing.

Dr. Hickok's elucidation of the essence and origination of matter reminds us of Sir Isaac Newton's conjecture that it is the resistance by the power of God to the advance of finite spirits into space. "We may be enabled to form some rude conception of the creation of matter, if we suppose that God, by his power, had prevented the entrance of anything into a certain portion of pure space, which is of its nature penetrable, eternal, necessary, infinite; for henceforward this portion of space would be endowed with impenetrability, one of the essential qualities of matter; and as pure space is absolutely uniform, we have only again to suppose that God communicated the same impenetrability to another portion of space, and we should then obtain, in a certain sort, the notion of the mobility of matter, another quality which is also very essential to it;" and he may as well have added extension and figure.

The difference between Newton and Hickok is, that the former makes matter to be the Divine agency resisting the action of finite spirits, and the latter considers it the force produced by the action of the Divine agency against itself, and in divers other ways, so that it would exist without any sentient creature to realize it.

Neither of these opinions will be confounded with the idealism of Berkeley, who held that the essence of matter was nothing but our perceptions, the mind being so constituted as to have these perceptions where no object really existed, just as we see things in our dreams. In this theory matter is wholly internal to finite minds; in the others it is external to finite mind; in Newton's it is relative to finite mind, but in Hickok's wholly independent of finite mind, for God can set his activity in counteraction and diremption, whether there be any finite spirit to cognize it or not.

T.

(16.) "*Sight and Hearing: how Preserved and how Lost.* By J. HENRY CLARK, M.D. Fifth thousand; carefully revised; with an index." (12mo., pp. 351. New York: Charles Scribner. 1859.) The examination of Dr. Clark's work will surprise most men not only with the amount of its valuable information but with the great deficiency of needed and available knowledge on the subject. Of a large mass of matter, important to our highest well-being, the public mind is not only greatly unaware, but greatly ignorant of its own injurious ignorance. From this ignorance, the wise laws of God in the structure of our noblest faculties are under wholesale violation, a violation involving just so much of self-destruction—a partial suicide. It is a great pity that the volume has to be read before the need of the perusal has to be felt. And it is a great pity that the need of the knowledge it affords will too seldom be felt until its suggestions will come too late. To every man then who is obliged or is habituated to task his eyes, to every literary man, and students especially, we say here are the last words of thorough science addressed in momentous warning and kindly direction to your special case.

Dr. Clarke's work is the result of profound study and great practical experience. It is full of the suggestions of wisdom, expressed with a happy clearness and directness of style. It is a model of a popular treatise by the scientific master. And we may, by the way, add, as no mean merit, that it is a model in the matter of book-making, being so well prepared with indexes and marginal titles of topics, that it is delightfully easy of reference, and so clear in type and space as to inflict but slight trial upon our shrinking optics. The book ought to be scattered broadcast through the land, and especially through our literary institutes, and the science it contains be concocted into popular knowledge and ordinary common sense.

There are valuable chapters on near-sightedness, middle-aged sight, artificial lights, overwork; glasses, when and what kind to be used; artificial eyes. The chapter on overwork is timely and important.

(17.) "*Lectures and Addresses on Literary and Social Topics.* By the late Rev. FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON, M.A., of Brighton." (12mo., pp. 318. Boston: Ticknor & Fields.) Of Mr. Robertson we have given some account

in a notice of a volume of sermons of his in the last number of our Quarterly. The present volume consists of two addresses to the Working Men's Institute of the city of Brighton; two lectures on the influence of poetry, before the same institute; a lecture upon Wordsworth, and several speeches delivered upon various topics in the same city. Mr. Robertson was latitudinarian in his theology, and hence liable to the pressure of opposition from the orthodox community. His religion may perhaps appear to have consisted rather of a union of poetical moral sensibility combined with humanitarian tendencies, than in any deep views of what we consider the Gospel of the Redemption. His views, such as they were, he was well able to invest in the most attractive garb of language. This, together with his natural gifts for finished and thrilling oratory, gave him an extraordinary popularity in the city of his residence. "To those who never heard Mr. Robertson speak, it may be interesting to learn that he was gifted with a voice of wonderful sweetness and power. So flexible and harmonious was it, that it gave expression to the finest tones of feeling; so thrilling, that it stirred men to the heart. His gesture was simple and quiet, his whole soul so thoroughly absorbed in his subject that all was intensely real, natural, and earnest."

The lectures upon poetry evince high powers of criticism, and high sympathies with his subject. The lecture upon Wordsworth shows Mr. Robertson to have been an enthusiastic admirer of that poet, and to have shared much of his contemplative nature, and transcendental proclivities. The perusal of Mr. Robertson's productions fully justifies the admiration of his friends; and their publication will secure him a wide circle of readers and admirers. We are continually reminded in his pages of strong points of resemblance in his character, position, principles and style, to those of Henry Ward Beecher. He possessed, perhaps, more grace but less vigor.

(18.) "*Christian Morals*. By JAMES CHALLENGER, Author of 'The Gospel and its Elements,' 'Christian Evidences,' etc. (24mo., pp. 199. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son; Lindsay & Blakiston. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman, & Co. 1859.) This very neat little manual assumes as its basis that Christianity contains the only sure and true code of morals, God's law being the standard, and his word the exposition of his law. Thence the author deduces the principles of practical and prudential morality. His style is neat, pure, and perspicuous; his morality elevated, and truly Christian.

III.—*History, Biography, and Topography.*

(19.) "*The Land and the Book*; or, Biblical Illustrations drawn from the Manners and Customs, the Scenes and Scenery of the Holy Land. By W. M. THOMSON, D.D. Twenty-five years a Missionary of the A. B. F. M. in Syria and Palestine. With maps, engravings, etc." (In two volumes, 8vo., pp. 560, 614. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859.) Mr. Thomson's book marks an advancing step in the progress of Palestinian geographical investigation. Hitherto our books on the Holy Land have been the product of transient

visitors. Those visitors have indeed been men of accomplished scholarship rare talent, and high enthusiasm, endowed with keen powers of investigation and attractive eloquence in the descriptive. Of all this the names of Robinson, Olin, Durbin, Bonar, and Prime, and, still later, we may add Professor Osborn, are an abundant demonstration. But accomplished as were the men, and rich as were the spoils and the laurels won from the sacred soil, they were but *visitors* still, liable to all the erroneous impressions, and capable of but the superficial observation of the rapid passenger. But Dr. Thomson is a *dweller in the land*. And all the superiority which we might anticipate, *a priori* from such a circumstantial advantage, will be found realized beyond our most sanguine fancy in the qualifications of the author and the qualities of his book. Born on the banks of the Ohio, Dr. Thomson has, during his quarter of a century's residence, not become indeed a *native* of the vales of the Jordan; but he has mastered with a wonderful completeness all that belongs to the topography, the history, the genius, and the destiny of that land and its occupants that can illustrate the sacred records or interest the Christian heart. Dr. Thomson's work stands eminent, nay, alone among all the publications in our language.

Dr. Thomson's mode is necessarily unlike that of ordinary tourists. It was of course out of the question for him, who had for twenty-five years itinerated like a roving Bedouin over all the territory, until he had formed a home familiarity with all its objects and modes, to narrate an actual journey. He therefore, somewhat after the plan of Barthelemi in his *Classical Travels* of Anacharsis, imagines a tour in which he is accompanied by a neophyte visitor, (with whom the reader may please to identify himself,) into whose mouth he puts all the *green* reflections and raw inquiries that naturally arise to a new traveler's mind and tongue. To these tentative efforts of his freshman, Dr. Thomson replies in a style so natural, so free, so simply colloquial in its ordinary level, yet so mounting into eloquent description or earnest declamation when borne by his subject, so copious, minute, and masterly in its information, so abundant in its illustrations of the narratives and solutions of the problems of the Holy Book, that we found ourselves spell-bound to its pages, and delightfully haunted by the reveries left on the memory.

Dr. Thomson does not make Egypt his starting point and work his way upward through the Holy Land. On the contrary, starting from Beirut, in the far north, he first skirts southwardly along the Mediterranean shore, through ancient Tyre and still more ancient Sidon, unfolding at every step, before the eyes of his questioning satellite, objects replete with profoundest interest. Thence slowly crossing, he descends through Banias, passing Lake Merom, to the shores of the ever memorable Gennesareth. Around these shores he makes the complete circuit, examining each locality with a mastery arising from complete familiarity, unfolding history, developing the peculiarities of the present age, and leaving his permanent mark upon the science of its geography. Thence bearing southward, covering by various detours the breadth of the land, Dr. Thomson gathers within his scope the varied interests that belong to Tabor, Nazareth, Cana, Esdraelon, Carmel, the sacred localities of Judea, verging at last to Jerusalem, (which, however, he but lightly touches,) and finally vanishing with sudden abruptness on the Mount of the

Ascension! To Dr. Thomson we think must be awarded the credit of decisively fixing the site of Capernaum. Indeed, the very etymology of the word, associated with the modern name of the locality, a name which is exempt from the slightest suspicion of imposture, fixes the site at Tell Hum. A Tell is a hill or an ancient site, and a Kefr is a village. How clearly then is the modern Tell Hum the same as the ancient Kefr na Hum. Dr. Thomson has also abolished the second Bethsaida, invented by Reland and imaginatively located by modern geographers on the western shore of Lake Gennesareth. The two Bethsaidas, erroneously supposed to be demanded by the sacred text, are reduced to a double Bethsaida on the opposite sides of the Jordan at its disemboisement into the lake. On the plains of Butaiha, curving around the northeastern margin of the lake, Dr. Thomson finds the grassy spot where the five thousand were fed, bounded by the high mountain of the Saviour's nightly prayer. He decides that the miracle of the two demoniacs could not have taken place at Gadara; which is twelve miles distant from the shore; but at Kerza, whose name, with a modified guttural and a reduplication, becomes Gergesa. At this place, and here alone, Dr. Thomson finds the proper proximity of the scene to the lake, and a mountain descent to its surface, down which the devils could precipitate the swine. Ranging along the southeastern circuit of the lake, Dr. Thomson unfolds to us the mysterious history and character of the fierce Bedouins, who with their whirlwinds of rapid cavalry, are sweeping farther and farther into the very heart of Palestine. At the southern extremity of the lake he recognizes the lost Dalmanutha in Dalhamia. Prosecuting his circuit, he lands at Tiberias; in whose history and character he finds many a pregnant topic of interesting remark.

Dr. Thomson frequently refers to the alarming rapidity and fearful devastation with which, in the present enervated state of the Turkish government, the Bedouins are spreading from the East, westwardly over the entire surface of Palestine, threatening to erase all traces of existing semi-civilization. Europe's "sick man," the grand Turk, is unable to take care of his patrimony; and the destructive freebooters of the East, as well as the civilized conquerors of the West, are pouncing upon his effects. At the present moment the freebooters are securing the start; and unless the sure progress of conquering civilization hastens its march, Dr. Thomson considers the case as approaching desperation.

It is wonderful to note how the immutability of eastern customs, even in the most trivial and spontaneous circumstances of action and idiom, has preserved to the present day the most striking proof of the truth of the Old Testament narratives. Nothing but detailed accounts and delineations, like those of Dr. Thomson, can convey a full impression of the reproduction at the present hour of the very form of character, slight peculiarity of action and spontaneous turns of expression, not only of the apostolic age, but of the most primeval patriarchal times. During the ensuing century all these peculiarities are to be swept away by the overwhelming tide of western civilization. Christianity, once sent from this land to the west, will again return to her ancient birthplace. It will be as a second advent of Christ; he will come clothed in the power of his kingdom. His Christi-

anity will carefully gather up, in imperishable daguerreotype, these treasured evidences of the truth of her own primeval history. She will erase, with a relentless yet beneficent hand, from the face of the land, all traces of the facts and customs that have waited for this daguerreotype before they disappeared at her advent. Then shall a new heaven and a new earth overarch and overspread her land. Again shall Christ establish his throne upon Moriah, replace his oracles in his ancient temple, and from Zion shall go forth his law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

(20) "*Trials of a Public Benefactor, as illustrated in the Discovery of Etherization.* By NATHAN P. RICE, M.D." (12mo., pp. 460. New York: Pudney & Russell.) This work narrates a disheartening tale, not of the ingratitude of republics, but of perfidy added to ingratitude on the part of the National Government of our own republic. It sets forth that Dr. William T. G. Morton, a young dentist of Boston, was led by gradual steps, during the practice of his profession, to the discovery and application of the anæsthetic properties of the sulphuric ether. With great perseverance, and in spite of dangers and misfortunes, he prosecuted his discovery to a practical perfection. Etherization is set forth as being a safe and widely extended means of performing the most difficult surgical operations upon individuals soothed into a state of harmless insensibility. While chloroform is charged with the causation of death, etherization, it is said, has never been clearly proved to have produced injurious results. As to the merits of etherization, and the justice of Dr. Morton's claims to its discovery, Dr. O. W. Holmes renders the following testimony.

"This discovery, it is conceded, is one of the most beneficial in its results that science has bestowed upon our race. The gratitude of all mankind belongs to those who have given it to the world, for all countries have received it, and all ages will accept it as one of the most signal triumphs of art over one of our most deadly and constant enemies, bodily pain, against which, in some form or other, it is half the business of life to struggle.

"If the discoverer has received no direct profit or indirect advantage from his labors for his fellow-creatures, everybody remains his debtor. If he has suffered in health and estate, the debt becomes one of honor, which it is a shame to the community to leave unpaid. He has a right to look to his country for it; its government is in the habit of voting swords and medals to its heroes, and can, if it will, reward its other benefactors.

"It is a notorious and wholly undisputed fact that Dr. Morton in person instituted the first decisive experiments at the risk of his reputation, and with a courage and perseverance without which, even had the idea of the possibility of such effects been entertained, the world might have waited centuries or indefinitely before the result was reached."

For his discovery Dr. Morton, by the advice of friends, took out a patent. But the government of the United States, it is averred by an arbitrary stretch of power, introduced the use of the discovery into army and navy, in total disregard of Dr. Morton's rights; and following its example, the institutions and professions generally of the country made free use of the discovery in unlimited violation of the chartered rights of the patentee. Discouraged by the universal defeat of his arrangements for the diffusive prosecution of the profitable use of his discovery, Dr. Morton, on consultation with wise advisers, concluded

to lay his claims for compensation before the national Congress. Three times was it brought before that body, at three successive sessions, and though supported by such men as Webster, Sumner, and Robert J. Walker, it was thrice defeated. Appealing from the ingratitude of the government, this book lays the case before the judgment of the nation and of history.

(21.) "*The Life and Remains of Douglas Jerrold*. By his son, BLANCHARD JERROLD." (12mo., pp. 459. Boston: Ticknor & Fields.) To Douglas Jerrold is doubtless due the memory we attribute to a wit of great colloquial powers and rich imaginative style. In these respects he is to be ranked we suppose with a Hood, a Sidney Smith, a Sheridan, and an Oliver Wendell Holmes. To men like these we pay the double tribute of an admiration and a sigh. That they are endowed with brilliant powers, finished with rare culture, and capable of rare achievements, and in their own way achieving rare results, we fully feel and abundantly acknowledge. But when we remember what were those results, and what the responsibilities imposed upon the powers that produced them, the smile of admiration is dimmed, and we grow pensive.

Yet the biographer and the friend claim for Jerrold that he was something above a mere wit; and that, if amusing effect was often his entire object, a more earnest purpose animated his heart, and his sprightly style and brilliant powers were in their boldest efforts directed to the highest aims of humanity. His filial biographer not only maintains, but almost threatens those who "doubted, insolently, his Christianity." A humanitarian aim, indeed, earnest, and we doubt not sincere, animated many of the contributions with which he enlivened the pages of *Punch*. As a satirist, he portrayed the lively contrast between the mercy and the charity of the Gospel, and the pride of the English hierarchy. He pleaded the cause of the poor. He directed the attention of the oppressive aristocracy to the sorrows of the starveling and the pauper. Yet in exhibiting the strong contrast between the benevolence of the Gospel and the haughtiness of the hierarchy, Mr. Jerrold carelessly leaves the strong impression that the hierarchy are the true representatives of the professed religion of the day, and that therefore all the professed religion is factitious, and all the true religion is with those that profess no religion, or nowhere at all. This is the assumption often made by men who, upon the strength of their strong advocacy of humanitarianism, and a bold but very unjust impeachment of the liberality and benevolence of the existing Church, claim to themselves a sort of supposititious righteousness, which effectually prevents their feeling of the need and their acceptance of the Divine atonement for many a sad delinquency of which they are, but too insensibly, guilty. To the brilliant pen of Jerrold, the *London Punch* owes much of its notoriety and power. Some of the specimens of satire selected in this volume are from his contributions to that periodical.

(22.) "*Experience of German Methodist Preachers*; collected and arranged by Rev. ADAM MILLER, M.D.; with an introduction by CHARLES ELLIOTT, D.D., and a preliminary discourse by L. L. HAMLINE, D.D." (12mo., pp.

430. *Cincinnati*: Printed at the Methodist Book Concern for the author R. P. Thomson, printer. 1859.) Our Cincinnati Book Rooms send us here a volume of biography and history combined, of a very suggestive as well as interesting character. It is the serial narrative of the pioneers of our Methodist "German work," beginning with its first originator, Dr. MILLER, the collector and writer of the whole, and his early distinguished coadjutor, Dr. William Nast. Like many a noble work, this new German reformation in America began as from a slender point, yet with many indications of suggestion from a Divine source, and opening with a gradually expanding prospect to which human vision can assign no limit. The book, though essentially a series of autobiographies, is written in a style of unassuming simplicity; and the entire work is expressed in clear, pure, manly idiomatic English. The substance of the biographies strongly reminds us of the histories of Mr. Wesley's early "helpers;" and furnishes us a singular and pleasing exemplification that the vital matter of primitive Methodism is yet living and strong in our day. There is in these biographies the same early groping for truth and thirst of the burning heart for salvation, turning every way for some relief, as the eye thirsting for light amid darkness turns to drink in the ray which it knows by its own instinct; there is the same depth of simple, heartfelt experience; the same weary seeking, the same joy in finding, and the same burning zeal for imparting to others the heavenly gift, finding in the very success of its work an ample reward for every privation. Thus by a singular providential demonstration do we find that at the close of her first century, Methodism "renews her youth, like the eagle," and reproduces the phenomena of her early day. Wesleyanism now repays to Germany the gift that the German, Peter Bohler, imparted to Wesley. And such is the deep and solid spiritual character of this volume, that we would not hesitate to present it to the acceptance of every truly Christian heart of every section of the Church, whether Romanist or Protestant, Churchman or Puritan, as demonstrative proof that our German work is truly a gracious work, and that the life that animates it is truly the life of New Testament Christianity.

And now the "history and mystery" of our German home movement is here, in its most interesting form, laid before the Church. Every mind awakening to its importance, and desirous to know its depth and breadth, has here the information. We trust that a renewed interest, deep and broad, will be felt in its prosperity by the heart of our entire Church, and that this book will find a spontaneous diffusion among our ministers and people.

(23.) *Biographies of Distinguished Scientific Men*. By FRANCOIS ARAGO, Member of the French Institute. First series." (12mo., pp. 444. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1859.) This is an American reprint of an English translation of a French work; another illustration of a fact of which illustrations are numerous, that science talks all languages, and belongs to the world. It is a philosopher's history of philosophers. The author, M. Arago, was born in 1786, in the department of the Eastern Pyrenees. He showed in very early life a taste for mathematical studies, entered the Polytechnic School at Paris in 1803, was made secretary at the Astronomical Ob-

servatory in 1805, and in 1806 was sent to Spain to measure an arc of the meridian, and after all sorts of adventures, returned to Paris in 1809, and was elected the same year a member of the Academy of Sciences, and a Professor of Geometry in the Polytechnic School.

As a member of the Academy, he was frequently called upon to read papers before the Institute, a number of them being memoirs of scientific men. In process of time he attained a degree of fame which renders it not immodest for men to assume that the public would like to know something about the process by which they have become famous, and an age which renders it not unbecoming to gratify that curiosity, and he accordingly wrote an autobiography.

These scattered memoirs have been collected and translated, and the first of the two volumes contemplated is before us. It consists of five memoirs, viz.:

1. An Autobiography of François Arago.
2. A memoir of John Silvain Bailly, who was a *savant*, and a patriot after the French style, the first President of the National Assembly after the quarrel with the throne; began, the first Mayor of Paris under the revolutionary regime, and one of the first victims of the revolutionary guillotine.
3. A memoir of Sir William Herschel, a Hanoverian musician, who emigrated to England, officiated as the leader of the band in an English regiment, gave private lessons in music, and finally applied himself to astronomy, and who, aided all through his career as a practical astronomer by a sister, as devoted to the science as himself, distinguished himself among the mighty men who have cultivated this noble science.
4. A memoir of the Marquis de la Place, Peer of France, the well-known author of the *Mécanique Céleste*.
5. A memoir of Joseph Fourier, academician, orator, traveler, who was one of the *savants* who accompanied Bonaparte in his expedition to Egypt, and who wrote the *Theorie Mathématique de la Chaleur*, which constitutes his principal claim to scientific celebrity.

This volume of biographies is a book exceedingly interesting to all classes of readers. The lover of general history will find in it new items illustrative of great men, great events, and memorable times; scientific men will prize it as a record of the progress of modern science; and the general reader will be delighted with its vivacity, humor, and stirring incidents. c.

(24.) "*Palestine, Past and Present*. With Biblical, Literary, and Scientific Notices. By Rev. HENRY S. OSBORN, A.M., Professor of Natural Science in Roanoke College, Salem, Va., member of the American Scientific Association, and Honorary Member of Malta (Mediterranean) Scientific Institute. With Original illustrations and a new map of Palestine, by the author." (8vo., pp. 600. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son, No. 25 South Sixth-street; J. B. Lippincott & Co.; Lindsay & Blakiston. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman, & Co. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. Cincinnati: Rickey, Mallory, & Co. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co.) Few pilgrims from our country have set out for the Holy Land equipped with a completer intellectual armor for a suc-

cessful foray upon her sacred treasures, or more likely to come off with richer spoils, or able to raise a nobler trophy. He is furnished with all the qualifications of finished scholarship, and equally qualified to unfold the recollections of history, to apply the tests of chemistry, or to analyze the roots of philology. He is an enthusiastic surveyor and an acute observer. His pencil is ever ready to portray the elaborate scenery, or to sketch the casual but characteristic object or incident. A genial and manly temper, expressing itself in a style of flowing amenity not often rising to elaborate eloquence, leads the willing reader with a gentle power. Typography has done her best to sustain, with consistent elegance, the product of the professor's mind. The finest material, liberal marginal and spacial distances, the richly colored engravings and extensive maps, are combined to furnish forth a very luxury of a book.

(25.) "*The Life and Times of Sir Philip Sidney.*" (12mo., pp. 281. Boston: Ticknor & Fields.) From the imperfect records in the meager biographies left by Fulke Greville, by Dr. Zouch, and from the fragmentary sketches scattered through biographical summaries, an attempt is here made to reproduce, as completely as possible, a true picture of Sir Philip Sidney. This eminent character is distinguished in history, less for what he accomplished than for what he was. Amid the constellation of illustrious men who adorned the age of Elizabeth with great exploits of war, profound researches of philosophy, or perpetual monuments of literature, he was able to be strikingly eminent by the rare perfections of his own being and nature. Noble in birth, beautiful in person, accomplished in manners, brilliant in genius, generous in soul, the completeness of his character disarmed all envy, and impressed his cotemporaries as a paragon of human nobleness, while he appears to posterity a myth of romance,—an ideality.

The style of the present biography is polished and graceful, and well adapted to present and preserve the unbroken ideal of elevated character. The volume, finished in the usual style of Ticknor & Fields, is a beautiful specimen of English biography.

(26.) "*A New History of the Conquest of Mexico*; in which Las Casas's denunciation of the popular Historians of that War are fully vindicated. By ROBERT ANDERSON WILSON, Counselor at Law, Author of '*Mexico and its Religion.*'" (8vo., pp. 539. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1859.) The title of this work indicates mischief, and its omens are prosecuted to a decidedly destructive result. Mr. Wilson maintains that the historians of Mexican conquest were stupendous romancers; that the splendid cities of Mexico and Tezcucuo were rude Indian towns, composed of mud huts; that the nations of the Mexican race were mere Indian tribes, and that Cortes was a mere fillibuster, of a model and magnitude little above General Walker. All this is serious enough; but the worst of it is that Mr. Wilson makes a strong case of it. The apparent consequences are that some splendid fictions must disappear from the story of our continent, and some of the most valued volumes, not only of Robertson but of Prescott, must leave the department of history, and take their position in the domains of romance.

(27.) "*Life of John H. W. Hawkins*, compiled by his son, Rev. WILLIAM GEORGE HAWKINS, A.M." (12mo., pp. 433. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. Cleveland, Ohio: Henry P. Jewett. New York: Sheldon, Blake-man, & Co. 1859.) This volume will be prized by the friends of the temperance cause throughout our country, both from the revered memory of the celebrated subject, and the intrinsic interest of its pages. Of that great cause Hawkins was a product, a phenomenon, and a faithful and untiring champion, until dismissed to his reward. He was a man of noble nature; and when the Washingtonian movement brought him before the public, his striking history and his marked ability gave tokens of a career which his unswerving history has nobly verified. He was a faithful Christian; and he never set his humanitarianism at antithesis with his religion. He was a consistent member of the Methodist Church, and rejoiced in the universal and hearty co-operation of her ministry and membership in his great cause. Blessed in its results to the world is such a life as his. The work of filial piety has been well performed in the preparation of this volume.

(28.) "*Passages from My Autobiography*. By SIDNEY, LADY MORGAN." (12mo., pp. 381. New York: Appleton & Co. 1859.) Lady Morgan still survives the age in which she shone; as the contemporary of Moore, Curran, Byron, and Shelley, she exhibited talents and faults akin to theirs, sharing their political if not fully their religious liberalism. Her France and Italy were piquant and perhaps truthful pictures, for the day, of those countries. The Quarterly Review endeavored to pour elaborated contempt upon her talents and pretensions; but the energy of the effort proved the insincerity of their disdain, while the spirit and brilliancy of her pages secured her the attention of the public, and a steadfast circle of admirers.

The present volume is a diary of forty years ago! In it La Fayette, Moore, Lady Caroline Lamb, and their compeers, live again. Its airy style, its womanly vanity, its reproduction of the brilliant past, render its pages not a little fascinating.

(29.) "*St. Augustine. A Biographical Memoir*. By the Rev. JOHN BAILLIE, Gonv. and Caius College, Cambridge. (24mo., pp. 305. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1859.) The remarkable series of experiences which distinguished Augustine's life, and of which his own pen has left so vivid a portraiture; the vast events, both secular and ecclesiastical, which filled the period of his existence; the resplendent genius of the man, the powerful impress which his mind stamped upon the theology of the West; the massy structure of the writings, brilliant with the luster of his splendid mind, which still stand in the library of the Christian Church, all combine to render his one of those characters in whom the interest of the world never dies. The little volume before us is written by a profound admirer of his greatness, and believer of his doctrines, and designs to exhibit the man as he appears in the light of our modern modes of thought.

(30.) "*History of the Reign of Philip the Second, King of Spain*. By WILLIAM H. PRESCOTT, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France,

etc., etc. Volume 3." (8vo., pp. 476. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. A melancholy interest now encircles this volume, arising from the demise of the celebrated author, which has lately awakened so deep a public regret.

The work now stands like a broken column, attractive alike from its own majesty and from the abruptness with which its completion has been interrupted. Yet though the power of the master will doubtless be missed, we are given to understand that a competent hand will bring the work to a suitable termination, from materials left by Mr. Prescott in his possession.

(31.) "*The Servant of his Generation. A Tribute to the Memory of the Rev. Jabez Bunting, D.D.*; being a Sermon Preached, on the occasion of his Death, in East Brook Chapel, Bradford, Yorkshire, July 18th, 1858; with a Sketch of his Character and Services. By FREDERICK J. JOBSON, D.D. (12mo., pp. 134. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. Sold by John Mason, 14 City Road, and 66 Paternoster Row. 1858.) Dr. Jobson's name is familiar to our minds from his brief mission as English delegate to our General Conference, and his powers as an able writer were fully recognized by the reception of his book of travels in our country. The sermon (received from the author) sustains his high reputation, and is well worthy its noble subject. The memoir which follows notes with conciseness the leading points of Dr. Bunting's life, and draws with skilful pencil the portraiture of his character.

(32.) "*Lives of the Queens of Scotland, and English Princesses connected with the Regal Succession of Great Britain.* By AGNES STRICKLAND. Vol. 7." (12mo., pp. 470. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859.) The present volume by this highly talented authoress contains the concluding part of the melancholy narrative of the life of Mary Queen of Scots. It closes with a thrilling description of the execution of that unfortunate princess.

(33.) "*Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa. Being a Journal of an Expedition undertaken under the auspices of H. B. M.'s Government in the years 1849-55.* By HENRY BARTH, Ph. D.D.C.L., Fellow of the Royal Geographical and Asiatic Societies, etc., etc. In three volumes." (8vo., pp. 800. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859.) This great work of Dr. Barth's is now brought to completion. Of the previous volumes we have given ample notice. All who are interested in lifting the veil from the face of this dark continent will find this great work an indispensable aid.

(34.) "*La Plata, the Argentine Confederation, and Paraguay; being a Narrative of the Exploration of the Tributaries of the River La Plata and adjacent countries during the years 1853, '54, '55, and '56, under the order of the United States Government.* By THOMAS PAGE, U.S.N., Commander of the Expedition. With Map and numerous Engravings." (8vo., pp. 632. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859.) This massive and richly illustrated volume will tend to throw new light into a country which, standing in close relation, geographically, with us, is almost as closed to our view as Africa or Asia.

(35.) "*Fankwei*; or, the San Jacinto in the Seas of India, China, and Japan. By WILLIAM MAXWELL WOOD, M.D., U.S.N., Author of 'Wandering Sketches in South America, Polynesia,' etc. (12mo., pp. 545. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859.) Dr. Wood is a lively and piquant writer; and, we doubt not, a reliable narrator of travels ranging through regions of great and increasing interest to the civilized world.

(36.) "*The New American Encyclopedia*; a Popular Dictionary of General Knowledge. Edited by GEORGE RIPLEY and CHARLES A. DANA. Vol. 4. Brownson—Chartres." (8vo., pp. 766. New York: Appleton & Co.) This volume appears promptly, and in the usual fine style. Among the names occurring are Brownson, O. A., Jabez Bunting, Prof. Bush, Horace Bushnell, the noted Stephen Burroughs, Elihu Burritt, John C. Calhoun, Alexander Campbell, and Dr. Capers. A cruel process this of making living men into a dictionary!

IV.—*Educational.*

(37.) "*Le Cabinet des Fées*; or, Recreative Readings, arranged for the express Use of Students in French. By GEORGE GERARD, A.M." (12mo., pp. 332. New York: Appleton & Co.) The compiler of this book intends it as a reading book in French, less elaborate than *Telemaque* or *Charles XII*, but more elevated than a series of fables. It consists of the *Fairy Tales* of Charles Perrault and *Madame de Beaumont*. It has no vocabulary, and very few notes.

V.—*Belles-Lettres.*

(38.) "*The Methodist*; or, Incidents and Characters from Life in the Baltimore Conference. By MIRIAM FLETCHER. With an Introduction by W. P. Strickland, D.D. In two volumes." (12mo., pp. 384, 360. New York: Derby & Jackson. 1859.) We have many volumes of fiction sent us, very few of which obtain notice, and still fewer a perusal. The reason is that we have arrived very fully at the age of realities, and have a most decided impatience of nonentities. Time is to us more than money; and we cannot expend it in swallowing vast volumes of vapor that leave us vacant and flatulent, with a consciousness of poorly performing the duties of brief life or preparing for the solemnities of long eternity. We do not wholly condemn fiction; but feel a dread of yielding any allowance to its claims, lest when an *inch* is given an *ell* will be taken. The reader of the right kind of fiction takes his place on the first descent of an inclined plane, and the difficulty is, no one knows where his slide will land him.

Yet there are some fictions, paradoxical as it seems, that are the most impressive conveyancers of truth. Others, so far as we can judge, are vehicles of salutary lessons, or exemplifications of great principles. And there are millions of minds for whom pure and concentrated truth is an indigestible and most distasteful aliment. An infusion of fiction is necessary to their receptivity. There are not a few fictions of the present day written with a truly religious purpose, and perhaps, upon the whole, productive of a salutary effect upon the

Christian community. These the veteran champions of "old-fashioned Methodism" can hardly condemn by wholesale, when they remember that Mr. Wesley not only read well selected works of fiction, but edited at least one of that class for the mass of his readers.

Our first impression on receiving the volumes before us was, that Methodism is in truth becoming *popular*! Dr. Stevens is investing us with magnificent history; we are now enveloped in the folds of romance; and doubtless we shall next etherealize into poetry. In this narrative Methodism, her institutes, sentiments, usages, and modes of expression, are all made to flow forth into streams of most mellifluous prose. Prismatic hues are made to fringe details hitherto of the most colorless brown. And why not? Does not romance, as well as Methodism, love to walk down along the vales of humble life, and blend her lights and shades in picturesque effect on scenes and dramas in which the actors themselves never dreamed of the poetry that was around and in them? Is Methodism out of the sphere of such effect because she ignores cold formalism and dry technicals, and, under a fresh effusion of the primitive spirit, dwells amid the holy emotions, and refuses content with anything less than assured divine communion with her God? Now Miriam Fletcher is decidedly a daring pioneer in the performance of making religious emotion and elevated spirituality very much the staple which, in a genuine novel, she essays to beautify to the æsthetical sense, and blend into harmony with our most refined susceptibilities. Others have portrayed prudential morality but ignored Christian piety; others again have, like Wordsworth, painted the picturesque associations that lie around religious establishments; others still have embodied polemics and defended dogmas or ecclesiastical systems in fictitious drama; but we do not now remember the instance in which, in the complete form and magnitude here presented, the strongest aspects of religious experience and movement portrayed with the geniality of a friend and the skill of a master. The style is chaste and flowing, the spirit is high-toned, the characters are graphically drawn, the dialogue is fluent and natural, the narrative is of absorbing interest, and the book is a decided success. Miriam Fletcher is, we understand, a fancy name; the wearer may doff her domino, and find she has a reputation to sustain.

The scene is laid in the sunny climes of Maryland and Virginia; where Methodism is supposed to prevail in her primitive and most luxuriant forms. Slavery, that topic of sorrow and rebuke, is depicted with neither an aggressive nor an apologetic hand. It is naturally flung into its prominent but subordinate relation, as an incidental but marked peculiarity of the society she describes. She truly depicts the undergrowth of affections which render even the tie of bondage sometimes a tie of heartfelt attachment, which modifies even what Wesley calls "the vilest system that ever saw the sun," and which Mrs. Stowe herself has fairly and genially painted in the proper place. Nevertheless the heart of the writer sighs with the sigh of the bondsman, beats for his good, and dwells in contemplation on the time and mode when the fetters shall melt and the oppressed go free. It is not indeed an anti-slavery novel, but its sympathies are on the side of truth and righteousness, and its tendencies are favorable to the sacred cause of human freedom.

VI.—Miscellaneous.

The following works our space does not allow us to notice in full:

"*The Mine*; or, Darkness and Light. By A. L. O. E." (48mo., pp. 212. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1859.)

"*The Poor Girl and the True Woman*. A Book for Girls. By WILLIAM M. THAYER. (24mo., pp. 353. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.)

"*Mendip Annals*; or, a Narrative of the Charitable Labors of Hannah and Martha More in their Neighborhood. Being the Journal of Martha More. Edited, with Additional Matter, by ARTHUR ROBERTS, M.A., Rector of Woodbridge, Norfolk." (24mo., pp. 253. New York: Carter & Brothers.

"*Onward*; or, the Mountain Clamberers. A Tale of Progress. By JANE ANNE WINSOM, Author of 'Vineyard Laborers,' etc. (Appleton & Co.)

"*What will he do with it?* By Pisistratus Caxton. A Novel. By SIR E. BULWER LYTTON, Bart." (8vo., pp. 311. New York: Harper & Bros.)

"*The Foster Brothers*; being a History of the School and College Life of Two Young Men." (12mo., pp. 405. New York: Appleton & Co. 1859.)

"*Sylvan Holl's Daughter*. By HOLME LEE." (Harper & Brothers.)

"*Letters of a Traveler*. Second Series." By WILLIAM CULLEN BRYANT." (12mo., pp. 277. New York: Appleton & Co. 1859.) This elegant volume arrived too late for a full notice. Its announcement must suffice, and will be sufficient for the countless host of Bryant's admirers.

"*European Life, Legend, and Landscape*." (8vo., pp. 154. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son; Lindsay & Blakiston. 1859.) The artist deals with a graphic pen, but furnishes no product of his pencil.

"*Struggles of the Early Christians from the Days of our Saviour to the Reign of Constantine*." (Boston: J. P. Jewett & Co. 1858.) The wonderful history of early Christianity, by no ordinary pen.

"*A Yacht Voyage*. Letters from High Latitudes. Being some Account of a Voyage in the Schooner Yacht 'Foam,' 85, O. M. to Iceland, Jan Mayen, and Spitzbergen, in 1856. By LORD DUFFERIN." (12mo., pp. 406. Boston: Ticknor & Fields.) His lordship handles a graphic pen.

"*The Persian Flower*. A Memoir of JUDITH GRANT PERKINS, of Oroomiah, Persia." (24mo., pp. 204. Boston: J. P. Jewett & Co. Cleaveland: H. P. B. Jewett. 1858.) A beautiful memorial, internally and externally.

"*The Higher Christian Life*. By W. E. BOARDMAN." (12mo., pp. 330. Boston: Henry Hoyt. Chicago: Wm. Tomlenson. 1858.) We regret that space does not permit a fuller recommendation of this interesting and valuable volume.

"*The Mustee*; or Love and Liberty." By B. F. PRESBURY. (12mo., pp. 487. Boston: Shepard, Clark, & Brown. 1859.)

"*The Laird of Norlaw*. A Scotch Story." (Harper & Brothers.)

Notices of the following works may be expected in our next number:

Prof. Masson's "Life and Times of John Milton," by Gould & Lincoln.

Guthrie's "Inheritance of the Saints," by Carter & Brothers.

Boardman's "Higher Christian Life," by H. Hoyt, Boston.

Jukes's "Types of Genesis," by Longman, London.

Bunsen's "Bibelwerk," first half volume. Leipsic: from Westerman.